



PREFACE

THIS book owes its existence to the Boden Professor of Sanskrit, Dr A. A. Macdonell, who suggested to me the writing of it, and who secured its acceptance for publication by the Delegates of the Clarendon Press. Professor Macdonell was also so good as to read the proofs of the first three sheets before he left England in 1907 for his tour in India, and for this and all the other help he has given me in the course of my Sanskrit studies I desire to express my most sincere thanks.

The editing of the text has been rendered possible for me by the liberality of the India Office and of the Royal Asiatic Society, which lent to me the manuscripts on which the text is based. To the Secretary of the Society, Miss Hughes, and to the Librarian of the India Office, Mr F. W. Thomas, I owe grateful acknowledgements of the assistance afforded me in this and other ways.

I have tried by the translation and commentary to extract as much as possible from the *Āitareya Āraṇyaka*, as I recognize that a text of this class should as far as practicable be made by its editor to yield all that can be derived from it for the knowledge of the period when it was produced. With this end in view I have added a series of Indexes which contain in great fullness the lexical material of the work while the material will also serve for grammatical purposes, as in each case the precise form which occurs is specified. I need make no apology for the distinction made between the Mantra, the *Āraṇyaka*, and Sūtra forms, not to distinguish the different strata of the text would be merely misleading.

In the commentary I have tried to avoid repeating what can easily be found in such standard works as the *St. Petersburg Dictionary*, Colonel Jacob's *Concordance* to the *Upanisads* and Deussen's treatise on the *Philosophy of the Upanishads*. Nor have I thought it worth while to note in detail the verbal coincidences between the *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa* and the *Āraṇyaka*. As might be expected they are constant and show unmistakeably the connexion of the two works. Some other points arising out of the book I hope to deal with elsewhere.

I had not originally any intention of including in the book the text of a portion of the Śāṅkhayana Aranyaka which now forms the appendix. I hoped that Dr Friedlander would complete his projected edition of that text, and it was only after a considerable portion of the book was in type that I learned that there was little or no prospect of the appearance of an edition at any early date. I then obtained the permission of the Delegates to print so much of the text of the Śāṅkhayana as was unpublished, and the Royal Asiatic Society were so good as to include a translation of the whole Aranyaka in their series of Oriental Translations, and to publish an article of mine on the Śāṅkhāyana Aranyaka in the Journal of the Society for 1908. The translation and the article will be found to supplement in some important points the information as to the Śāṅkhayana contained in this book.

The printing of the work has occupied over two years, and has entailed a good deal of trouble on all those concerned with it. I desire to express my thanks to Mr R. W. Chapman, of the Clarendon Press, for the interest which he has taken in it and for valuable suggestions which he has made from time to time on points of form. It gives me also much pleasure to acknowledge the great pains taken by the Oriental Reader of the Clarendon Press, Mr J. C. Pembrey, Hon. M.A. of Oxford, in dealing with the proofs. For such errors as remain I must accept responsibility. This is the fourth book of mine which has had the advantage of Mr Pembrey's care and skill, and I feel that it would be difficult to exaggerate the value of his assistance.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH

LONDON

July 11, 1909



CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	I
I The Text	I
II The Commentaries	11
III Divisions of the Āranyaka and their date	15
IV The Mahavrata ceremony, and the relation of Autareya Āranyaka I and V to the Śāṅkhayana Āranyaka	26
V The Upanisads of the Autareya Āranyaka	39
VI Style and Grammar	52
TEXT AND CRITICAL NOTES	76
TRANSLATION AND NOTES	161
APPENDIX ŚAṆKHAYANA ĀRANYAKA VII-XV	305
INDEXES	329
I Quotations from Rgveda	329
II Quotations from other sources &c	334
III Proper Names excluding those of Deities	342
IV Words in Verses other than Rgvedic &c	344
V Words in Āranyakas I-III other than words in quotations	354
VI Words in Āranyaka V and in the parallel passages of Śāṅkhayana Āranyaka I and II other than words in quotations	378
VII Beginnings of Khandas of Āranyakas	385
VIII Introduction and Notes	388

THE AITAREYA ĀRANYAKA

INTRODUCTION

I The Text

WHEN, in June 1905 I commenced preparations for the production of an edition of the Aitareya Āranyaka, I was mainly influenced by the expectation raised in part by the reference in Prof Buhler's Report¹ on his Kashmir journey to differences in the text in a birch bark MS, that it might be possible to amend considerably the text of Rajendralala Mitra's edition. Rajendralala used only two complete MSS of the text, and three of Sayana's commentary, besides three other MSS of parts of the text or commentary and it seemed reasonable to suppose that the employment of additional MS material would add to the correctness of the text. This expectation has not been justified. The use of additional MSS enables me to correct a good many slips and one or two serious omissions in Rajendralala's text but it establishes the fact that the tradition as to the text seems unbroken. Variant readings occur here and there but none of sufficient importance to justify the idea that any different recensions of the text ever existed and it is hardly ever possible to feel serious doubt as to the correct reading. What is especially important is that MSS from both the extreme north—as Buhler's MS from Kashmir—and the south agree in presenting the same text. Further the commentary of Sayana presents the same text as the commentaries of Sankara on Books II and III, and of Ānandī-tirtha and Viśveśvara on the same books.

The MS Material

The MSS which directly or indirectly have been used for this edition are as follows —

1 A This MS is dated *sarvat* 1654 (= A D 1797) and contains the text of the Āranyaka complete. It belonged to Colcbrooke, who

¹ *Journal Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society* 1877 Extra No. p. 34

annotated it, and used it when writing his *Essays*. The substance of his note on the authorship, *Essays*, I, 46, occurs on fol 60^r of the MS. The MS is No 76 in Eggeling's *Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS in the Library of the India Office*, Part I. Written on paper in Devanagari.

2. B This MS is on birch-bark and in Sāraḍa characters. It contains the Rgveda Samhitā the Khilakanda, and on ff 188^v-191, the Aitareya Āraṇyaka, Book III, only. It was discovered by Prof Buhler, and the information it offers regarding the Khilas is discussed by Prof Macdonell, *Bṛhaddevatā*, I, xxxi. See also Max Muller, *S B E*, I, lxxviii, lxxix, who used it in preparing his translation of the Upaniṣad, and Dr Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rgveda*, pp 32 sq, 167, 168. It probably dates about A D 1575¹.

The variants of this MS have been referred to as important, both by Buhler and Dr Scheftelowitz. This view appears to me erroneous. Whatever may be the value of the MS for the criticism of the text of the Rgveda² it contributes, in my opinion not a single correction to the text of Āraṇyaka III. It contains many errors e.g. *prajaya*, *prajayah* for *prajāyā*, *samhitāya* for *samhitāya*, *sandhya* for *sandhya*, *abhyasam* for *abhyāsam*, &c. Most of its variants can be proved incorrect from the context. In III, 1, 4, *cen* is omitted in the first clause, but in the second *cen* occurs and it is most improbable that the word should be omitted in the first of two precisely parallel clauses. Then also *chaknuḥ antam* is read without the negative, which reduces the passage to nonsense. In III, 1, 5, *putra* is omitted before *rupam* but the context urgently requires its presence, the words *putra aha* are also omitted, but leave *madhyamaḥ* unintelligible, and *ekikurvan* for *anekikurvan* is contradicted by the next clause. In III, 1, 6, a whole clause is omitted because it begins and ends with the same words as the preceding clause, *tam* is omitted in a Rgvedic quotation while by diplography *sa saṁsaditih* stands for *saṁsaditih*. In III, 2, 1, an unnecessary *iti* is inserted before *etat proktam*, presumably because an *iti* is expected with the form *proktam*, and the whole phrase *trayam tv eva na śy etat proktam* is repeated in III, 2, 2, where it is not in place. In III, 2, 1, it is required because it contradicts a view of Hrasva Mandukya that there was a fourth class. In III, 2, 2, the threefold division is accepted. The same tendency to

¹ See my note, *J P A S*, 1907, p 275

² Cf Oldenberg *Gott gel An.*, 1907, pp 235 sq

diplography is seen in the double *akar* in the same section. In III, 2, 3, the obvious *brahmanam* appears for *brahmānam*, but just before we have *brahmā rasah*. In the list in III, 2, 2, *manomayak* is wanting, but it appears in the precisely similar list in III, 2, 3. Another omission is seen in *nasyanukte*, III, 2, 4, for *na tasyanukte*, and 'mato has fallen out between 'gato and 'nato. The defective *āskandati* is balanced by *jīvaśyati*.

Other alterations are inferior in sense. In III, 2, 4 *vāśariram* for *vāśirasam* after *jānuśirasam* postulates the possibility of perceiving a disembodied spirit, which is difficult, *caṇḍrama evādityo*, *ibid*, is inferior to *vādityo*, *apagirati* is required rather than *avagirati*, &c.

The only passage in which B offers at first sight a better text is III, 2, 6 *Prajapatih prajah sista vjasiamsat a samvatsaram*, where it may be suggested to take *a samvatsaram* as = over a year. This is not quite impossible but it is not likely, and then the proper form is undoubtedly the middle, cf *śisramsata*, *Āitareya Brahmana*, III, 27, &c. Further, it is very difficult to see how the standard text could ever have been altered from this reading. But palaeographically the corruption found here is quite easy. *d* and *t* are not very different in Saradī MSS, and *t* actually appears for *dh* in III, 2, 3 *anuvitan* for *anuvadhām*, a much less easy mistake. Then *a* and *ā* are often interchanged, as in *amritam* just cited, and in *anyam*, III, 2, 3, for *anyani*, *anusamhitam*, III, 2, 6, for *anusamhitam samvatsaram* may have followed when *a* became *ā*, or have been an independent attempt at an easier reading.

Other errors are the interchange of *a* and *ā*, *śamhitah*, III, 1, 1, for *śamhitah*, *batarakam*, III, 2, 4, for *batarakam*, of *a* and *e* the characteristic stroke for the latter being omitted *agnar* and *ratrisuktana*, III, 2, 4. *r* is treated like *ri* and so written in *rite*, III, 2, 2, so in the *Khulas*, V, 3 *rajrin rājase* is written for *rajrin*, cf *Scheftelowitz*, p. 175. *i* and *ī* are also confused.

In some points the MS is accurate. Before gutturals and labials the appropriate sign for *h* is used. For *h s* or *h s*, *śs* or *śs* always occur, and anusvara is practically never misused. After *r* and *m* duplication of consonants is regular, and for *d ha* is always written *d dha*.

But on the whole, I consider the MS, though in many ways valuable, yet to contain many corruptions due in part to the errors inevitable in transcription and copying of Saradī MSS and in part to attempted correction of the text. The result of the comparison with the text of the

Āranyaka and with the Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka leads me to look with doubt on the readings of the MS where they differ from other sources

3 C This MS was written in *lake* 1385 (= A D 1663), *śobha asadhatat* 7 *dhrgan* by Saradanandavamsodbhava Mahadeva. The first sixteen leaves, however, are in a different hand and originally formed part of another MS. They contain part of Book II, while the rest of the MS contains part of Book III (ff 17-103) and the last Khanda of the third Adhyaya of Book V, in each case with Sayana's commentary. See Eggeling No 83. Written on paper in Devanagari.

4 D This MS is one of the Whish collection in the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society. It is on palm leaves and in Grantha characters, legible and not very incorrect. See Thomas in Winternitz *Catalogue of South Indian Sanskrit Manuscripts*, No 191. It contains the Āranyaka complete. Its probable date is A D 1700.

5 E This MS was presented by Dr Burnell to the India Office. It is fairly well written in Grantha characters on palm leaves. It is No 84 of Dr Burnell's collection, see *Catalogue of a Collection of Sanskrit Manuscripts*, Part I *Vedic Manuscripts*. It contains the Āranyaka complete. It probably dates from the eighteenth century.

6 F This MS belonged to Colonel Claud Martin and like G appears to have been presented to the India Office by Colebrooke. It forms part of a corpus consisting of the Āśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra Purvasatka (ff 1-20) Uttarasetka (ff 1-11) Grhya Sūtra (ff 1-17) Sarvanukramani (ff 17-24) and Āranyaka (ff 25-35). It contains the Āranyaka complete. See Eggeling No 80. Written on paper in Devanagari about the end of the eighteenth century.

7. G Like F this MS belonged to Col Claud Martin, and was presented to the India Office by Colebrooke. It also contains a corpus consisting of Āśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra, Purvasatka (ff 1-64), Uttarasetka (ff 1-40), Grhya Sūtra (ff 1-26) Sarvanukramani (ff 1-28) and Āranyaka (ff 1-45), complete. See Eggeling No 79. Written on paper in Devanagari about the end of the eighteenth century. This MS is closely connected with F.

8 H This MS contains the commentary of Visveśvaratīrtha on a commentary by Anandatīrtha on Books II and III of the Āranyaka. The text is not cited in full but the commentary shows that it was identical with the text of Sayana. See Eggeling No 84. Written on paper in Devanagari in the seventeenth century.

See Eggeeling No 87 Written on paper in Devanāgarī in *sauvat* 1853 (= A D 1796)

18 25 R¹⁻³ are the MSS used by Rajendralāl Mitra for his edition, *Aitareya Aranyaka with the Commentary of Sayana Acarya Bibl Ind*, Nos 325 329 335 337, and 345 Calcutta, 1875-1876 Their description is (Intro d, pp 20, 21) as follows —

Āa (= R¹), lent by Pandit Vamana, of the Benares Sanskrit College dated *sauvat* 1816 (= A D 1759) *irodhisamvatsare karttikasuklasaptamyaṃ Viśveśvararajadhanyam* It contained the commentary of Sayana on the whole Āranyaka

Kha (= R²), from the Sanskrit College at Calcutta, containing Sayana's commentary on Books I and II Apparently old

Ga (= R³) from Dr G Buhler of Bombay, dated *śraṇanavadi* 30 *śamvatsare* sake 1788 (= A D 1866) *śrāṇanamamamvatsare*, containing the commentary complete

Gha (= R⁴) copied for Rajendralāl under the superintendence of Babu Amṛtalāl of Benares and collated with two different codices the codex copied being dated *sauvat* 1828 (= A D 1771) *śraṇanavadi* 3 It contained the commentary complete

Ka (= R⁵) copied for Rajendralāl under Amṛtalāl's superintendence and collated with a MS dated *sauvat* 1775 (= A D 1718) *śrāṇanamamvatsare dakṣinayane vasi śraṇan bhādrapade masi kṛṣṇapakṣe bhṛguvāsare taddine pustakam samapam* It contained the text complete

Kha (= R⁶) copied for Dr Burnell of Mangalore and lent to Rajendralāl The original belonged to a pandit in Tanjore It contained the text complete Cf E

Ga (= R⁷) from the Library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal containing Book II only of the text, written in the saka year named Vyaya by Narayana of Candrapura for his master Śivarama

Gha (= R⁸) from the Library of the Sanskrit College, Calcutta, containing Book IV, with Sayana's commentary

Of these *ka* and *kha* (presumably R⁵ and R⁶) are said to belong to the same class But it is clear that Rajendralāl merely compiled an eclectic text from the various MSS and that he did not contemplate a critical text R denotes the reading of the edition when it appears to rest on all the MSS available

26-34 S¹⁻⁸ are the MSS used in the edition in the Anandasrama

series, 1898, No 38, with Sāyana's commentary by Bābāśāstri Phādake. They are as follows —

Ka (= S¹), containing text and commentary complete, belonging to Śrīmat Gurmahārāja, of Karavīrapura

Kha (= S²), containing text and commentary complete, belonging to Gaṅgādhara Śāstri Dātāra, of Puṇyapattana

Ga (= S³) and *Gha* (= S⁴), containing text and commentary complete, from the Ānandāśrama library

Na (= S⁵), containing text and commentary of Books II-IV, belonging to Bhāūsāheba Bālāsāheba Kibe, of Indūrāpura

Ca (= S⁶) and *Cha* (= S⁷), containing text only, from the Ānandāśrama library

Ja (= S⁸), containing text only, belonging to Bhāūsāheba Bālāsāheba Kibe, of Indūrāpura

Jha (= S⁹), containing text only, belonging to Śankarārāva Bhāgavata, of Thāne.

There is no doubt that some care has been taken in giving the variant readings which are practically confined to the commentary. Where the MSS appear to agree, S is used to denote the reading of the edition. The text of the Āranyaka in this edition contains some errors and omissions, but is superior to that of Rājendralāla.

35. T. This is the version found in the collection of 108 Upaniṣads published in Telugu character at Madras in 1883. It contains no important variants, and seems conclusively to prove that the South had no separate recension. See Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's des Veda*, p 534. In view of Sankara's influence in Southern India, this was only to be expected.

36. U. This symbol is used to denote the text of the Upaniṣad with Sankara's commentary, Ānandatīrtha's super-commentary, and with Vidyāranya's (Sāyana's) *Dīpikā*, published in the Ānandāśrama series, 1889, No 11. For this edition were used five MSS (*ka, kha, ga, gha, na*) of the text, commentary, and super-commentary, six MSS (*ca, cha, ja, jha, tha, da*) of the commentary, two MSS (*ka, kha*) of the text alone, and four MSS (*ka, kha, ga, gha*) of the *Dīpikā*, besides two editions (*ña, ta*). The variants are, however, almost confined to the commentary.

37. W. This MS contains Sāyana's commentary on Book I of the Āranyaka. It is on palm-leaves and in Malayālam characters, and is very

inaccurate. It is one of the Whish MSS in the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society. See Winternitz, No 1 (b), who assigns it to the eighteenth or nineteenth century.

38 X This MS contains Sankara's commentary on Books II and III of the *Āraṇyaka*. It is written on palm leaves in Maṭṭyaṇāṁ characters. The MS is much damaged. It is No 158 in Winternitz's *Catalogue*, and may be assigned to the seventeenth century.

Of these MSS I have collated all save R¹ ², S¹-², and those used in U. There are many other MSS and editions of the Upanisad in existence and several MSS of the *Āraṇyaka* (see Aufrecht *Catalogus Catalogorum*, s. vv.) but there is no reason to suppose that any of them would add anything new to the text. Max Müller used (cf. *SBE*, I, xcvi) a MS of the text with Sankara and Anandatīrtha's commentaries, and also a commentary by Sankara¹ on Book III, *Adhyaya* 1, but he states that the MSS he used gave little aid. It appears from Weber's *Catalogue* that the Berlin MSS have no independent value.

The MSS used are on the whole decidedly inferior. They are modern copies and contain many clerical errors. No useful purpose would be served by recording all the blunders of the scribes. I have therefore printed only those which seemed of more importance, either textually or palaeographically, save in the case of B, in view of the special—if somewhat artificial—interest of that MS.

In Rājendralāla's edition, and in Max Müller's translation of the first three books of the *Āraṇyaka* (*SBE* I) the text besides the division into *Adhyayas* and *Khandas* shown in all the MSS, is divided into short sections which are numbered. These numbers seem to be attributable to Rājendralāla himself, as there is no trace of them in any of the MSS I have used or in the *Ānandaśrama* edition. The divisions follow the treatment by Sayana of the text in his commentary, but they cannot be said to be always satisfactory, consistent or convenient, and I have not felt bound to adopt them. None of the MSS show any satisfactory or consistent punctuation—such a punctuation being practically unknown in Sanskrit MSS of prose works—and I have therefore adopted what seemed to me the most convenient punctuation.

¹ That this is the correct description of the work follows from a comparison with X though the MS does not name the author (Wickremas inghe *JRAS*, 1901, p. 632).

In the Upanisad (II 4-6) within the Khandas there is a division into sections in accordance with Sankara's commentary which differs greatly from that of Sayana, and which has been adopted in the editions of the Upanisad. This enumeration might have been retained for convenience of reference, but for the sake of consistency I have preferred to omit it.

With regard to the text of Sāyana's commentary it may be observed that neither Rājendralāla nor the Ānandaśrama edition gives a very correct version. It is clear that Rājendralāla freely corrected his MSS, and that even the numerous variants given in the Ānandaśrama do not exhaust the variations of reading. Curiously enough the editors of the latter cannot have consulted the former. For example the commentary on *madhumati* in V, 2, 2, reads *saraso* (*casau* is suggested as a correction) *madhavadimadhuryarasopetatvan madhumaṇ*. Rājendralāla has *sa ca somayādīmadhuryarasopetatvan madhumaṇ* which, as the noun is (*upa*) *prakṣe* glossed as *yagapradeśe*, is neat and convincing. Or again V, 2, 1, where Rājendralāla has the obvious *savaḥ 2 airmaṇi balaṇi*, while the Ānandaśrama has [*2 airi*] *nam* [*2 avo?*] *balaṇi* while just after *in ativyathā* is rendered according to Rājendralāla *enam śatruṇi atisajena calitavan*, and according to the Ānandaśrama *imam satruṇi* &c. One MS, S², has *santum*, and of course there is no easier mistake in MSS than that of *tr*, *tt*, and *nt*, while interchange of sibilants is constant. Or again in the quotations at the end of V, 1, 5, both editions present bad texts but Rājendralāla has *etac karma* while the Ānandaśrama has *etac ca karma*, which in view of the context is absurd. Many other instances could be quoted, and undoubtedly either in many places Rājendralāla's MSS were superior or his critical judgement was better, probably the former. Further, there are repeated,—sometimes very serious, e.g. I, 5, 2,—omissions in the Ānandaśrama text, and in places, e.g. I, 5, 1, the text has been badly confused.

On the other hand, there are many instances where the Ānandaśrama text is superior to that of Rājendralāla. For example the note in the latter edition on II, 3, 4, p. 226, line 3 from foot *dhyanyajñam² anenakapaḥṣak* is meaningless, but a perfectly good sense is given by the Ānandaśrama reading (see note on II 135) *Dhyanajñam*.

¹ Cf. the absurd reading in the ed. of Latayana Śranta Sutra III, 1*, 11, *Dhānaryajñak*.

The comparison of the two editions would give a satisfactory text in all respects save in quotations from unknown works. In these Rajendralāla is usually superior to the Ānandaśrama but neither is very accurate, and further MS authority would be requisite.

From a comparison of the recorded readings the MSS of the commentary appear to be divisible into the following classes: (1) R¹, and R², with which may be classed C, and so far as it goes I, (2) S¹, S², S³, S⁴, which approach closely to class (1)—in this class S¹ and S², and S³ and S⁴ are closely related, (3) S⁵ which falls into a distinct class of its own, (4) R³ and R⁴ which again form a distinct class, and (5) W.

The MS material available would not suffice to form a text either of Śankara's commentary on the Āranyakas II and III, or of Visveśvara's super commentary on Ānandatīrtha's commentary on those Āranyakas the more so in the latter case that no MSS of the commentary itself have yet come to light.

In the edition of Rajendralāla and in the MSS A and E only are accents used. These accents are clearly confined to those verses not occurring in the Rgveda Samhitā which are quoted in full in the Āranyaka V. Unfortunately in the edition the accents are often obviously incorrect, one word having two accents, or a series of words being incorrectly accented so as to show that an error in printing must have taken place. The MSS also, as often, are carelessly and inaccurately accented, and it is therefore not possible to lay stress on the accentuation of any rare words, especially compounds. The matter is of little consequence, however, as the total number of accented words is small and nearly all, save a few compound words are recorded in well accented texts.

It may here be mentioned that I have, wherever necessary, restored correct spellings, e.g. *pattram* not *paṭram*, and have in accordance with the normal practice of the MSS,¹ omitted visarga before a sibilant followed by a hard consonant. In the case of *ck* I have never inserted the *c*² but in deference to the ordinary practice I have always written *tad dhi*, not *tad hu*, and of course *uddhṛtya* for *ud hṛtya*. On the other

¹ Cf. Macdonell *Bṛhaddeśvata* I xxvi, n. 4. Allowed by Vārttika on Paṇini, VIII 3, 36.

² Cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar* § 277. In Lanman's edition of Whitney's translation of the Atharvaveda *ck* is

written everywhere even when *ck* represents an assimilated letter + *ck*, e.g. *bhacchanti*, in which case *ck* is used in this edition. Cf., however, Wackemagel *Altindische Grammatik* I, 154 sq., Macdonell *Vedic Grammar*, p. 31.

hand, duplication after *r* has been omitted, though it is usual in all the MSS, while the *avagāha* is inserted wherever it is properly required despite its omission in the MSS. The nasal in *Pluta* is represented by the *aṅhricandra* mark. In R the ordinary *anusvāra* is used as is done in the MSS, but not in S.

II The Commentaries

The commentaries on the *Āraṇyaka* which I have used are the following —

1 *Śaṅkara's* commentary on the *Upaniṣad* (II, 4-6). *Śaṅkara's* date has now through the evidence of the *Āryavidyaśudhāra* and Patil's researches (*Journal Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society*, XVIII, 88, 218 sq.), been definitely fixed from A D 788 to the middle of the ninth century. The date A D 820 formerly assigned to his death, must refer to the commencement of his labours. This commentary has been repeatedly printed, best in the *Anandaśrama* series Poona, 1889.

2 *Śaṅkara's* commentary on Book II, the first part of the *Mahātmya*. This is only available in the MSS P and X, neither of which presents an accurate text. In the *Adhyāyas* 4-6, it is of course identical with (1). Fortunately the analogy of *Sayana's* commentary on *Adhyāyas* 4-6 and comparison of the two commentaries on *Adhyāyas* 1-3 establish the fact that *Sayana* followed *Śaṅkara* with considerable fidelity.

3 *Śaṅkara's* commentary on Book III, the *Sambhūtopaniṣad*. This is only available in the MS X but is followed by *Sayana*.

4 *Anandatīrtha's* super commentary on *Śaṅkara's* commentary on the *Upaniṣad*. *Anandatīrtha* is said to have died in A D 1198 and to have been a pontiff of the *Madhva* sect (*Bhandarkar, Report on the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts*, 1882-1883 pp 18-103). The date has recently been questioned by *Harikṛṣṇa Śāstrin* (*Epigraph Ind.*, VI, 261) who prefers to date him from A D 1238-1317, on epigraphic evidence of considerable weight. This commentary has frequently been printed, best in the *Anandaśrama* series. As has been mentioned above in several MSS the commentary is attributed to *Abhinavānāraṇyendra*, who in one of the MSS in the Bodleian Library (*Catalogue*, No 977) is thus described: *śrī śrīmatkāṭyaśāstrīnārāyaṇendrasarasvatīpūjyapadaśiṣyāśrīmatjñāna-*
drasarasvatīpūjyapadaśiṣyāśrīmadalīnārāyaṇendrasarasvatīnā-
cītyām Aṅgabhīratīkṛtām. There can be little doubt but that we

must assume Ānandatīrtha's real name to have been Abhinavanārayanendra Sarasvatī, especially as he is indifferently called Ānandatīrtha, Anandagiri, or Anandajñāna, the name he probably took as pontiff.¹ Cf also No 1010 (3) in the *Catalogue*, where he is called Narayanendra Sarasvatī

5 Viśveśvaratīrtha's super commentary on Ānandatīrtha's commentary on Books II and III This is only available in the MSS H and O, and no MSS of the commentary itself appear to be extant Ānandatīrtha, who is called *bhagavatpadacarya*, must, I think, be identical with the Ānandatīrtha above mentioned, and must have written two different works in connexion with the Aranyaka, first the super-commentary on Śankara's commentary, and second an independent commentary on the Aranyaka, in which he interprets it in a Vaisnava sense Max Müller (*S B E*, I, xcvi) appears to doubt this identity, but it must be remembered that Ānandatīrtha was a Madhva and so not unlikely to be disposed to adopt a Vaisnava interpretation and that there is nothing rare in Indian literary history in finding an author ready to comment on both sides of a question Compare the case of Vacaspatimīśra,² who wrote commentaries on the works of all the philosophical schools save one Further the interpretation of Śankara had always to contend against that of Ramanuja,³ and it was by no means unnatural for a scholar like Ānandatīrtha to set forth both views, the Vaisnava interpretation representing his own

Viśveśvaratīrtha appears to have been the pupil of Ānandatīrtha, and to have written this work in the lifetime of his master, as is indicated by verse 3 of the introduction *Aitareyopaniṣado 'yākurmo bhāṣyam uttamam | brūmadanandatīrtharyam nātā tatpratikamulak || 3 ||* It is worth noting that Jayatīrtha, the successor of Ānandatīrtha similarly wrote a super commentary on Ānandatīrtha's commentary on the Praśna Upaniṣad, and that that commentary is distinct from Ānandatīrtha's super commentary on the commentary of Śankara on that Upaniṣad⁴ The same remark⁵ applies to Ānandatīrtha's commentary on the Īśvasya Upaniṣad and to his super commentary on the commentary of Śankara

¹ So Jayatīrtha's original name was Raghunātha, Bhandarkar l c

² See Cowell and Gough Translation of *Sarvaśāstrasamgraha* Preface p v l n 1

³ See Thibaut *S B E*, XLVIII, *J P A S*, 1906 pp 490-93

⁴ See the *Bibliothèque Catalogue*, No 1013 (2)

⁵ *Ibid* No 1013 (3)

on that Upanisad Viśveśvara was evidently closely connected with Anandatīrtha, as a MS of Anandatīrtha's super commentary on Sankara's commentary on the Brhadaranyaka Upanisad of the seventeenth century is described by a later hand as *Viśveśvaranandatīrthamathastham* (Bendall, *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the British Museum*, p. 15) Bendall I c, refers to a commentary by Viśveśvaratīrtha on the super commentary of Anandatīrtha on the Brhadaranyaka Upanisad, but the evidence cited above leaves little doubt but that the commentary of Viśveśvaratīrtha is on an independent commentary by Anandatīrtha and not on his super commentary. The exact locality of this Math is unknown but Jayatīrtha it may be noted, was a native of Mangalavedhem near Pandharpur.

6. *Sāyana's* commentary on the whole Āraṇyaka. Besides the edition of Rajendraśāstra Mitra and that in the Ānandaśrama series I have used MSS C, I and W. There are many minor variants in the text but there is no trace of any double recension. In the Ānandaśrama edition of the Upanisad the commentary is attributed to *śrīmatpara mahānīlavarīrajaśāstrakārya vidyāranyamuni*. This as Kleinm has shown in the *Gurupūjākalpanī*, is the title of Madhava the brother of Sayana, and not of Sayana. This attribution to Madhava is an error, Sayana in the preface tells us distinctly that the work is his *tātkālakṣena tadārupam dadād Bukkamaśūpatih 1 adīśat Sayanācāryam vedārthasya prakāśane* || 3 || In all probability it was genuinely composed by Sayana himself, it agrees with his Rgveda commentary in general and was written after the commentary on the Aitareya Brahmana. It was written probably under Bukka I, who was certainly reigning in A.D. 1354. That Sayana died in A.D. 1387 is probably an error, though that may be the year of Madhava's death. His commentary throughout is dependent on that of Sankara on Books II and III, as he admits in the introduction to Book II.

Sankara, Anandatīrtha in his super commentary, and Sayana all interpret the Upanisads in II and III in the light of the Vedānta. On the other hand Viśveśvara in the super commentary follows Anandatīrtha in giving a Vaiṣṇava interpretation. I have not followed either view. The Upanisads can only be satisfactorily explained by regarding them as what they are, early attempts at philosophy, and by refraining from reading later ideas into them. The interpretations given by the com-

mentators have, however, a value as showing the development of philosophical ideas, and I have therefore whenever desirable referred to them. In several cases too they afford great assistance in the interpretation of the text.

It may here be mentioned¹ that most of Book II, that is, Adhyāyas 1-3, 4, and Adhyāyas 4-6, are translated by the author of the Persian translation which was made for Dara Shukoh between A.D. 1656-1657, and retranslated into Latin in 1801, 1802, by Anquetil Duperron. This translation, besides being much less intelligible than the original, adds, as far as I can see, nothing substantial to our knowledge.

The commentary of Śaṅkara establishes for the ninth century the text of the second and third books of the Aranyaka as we now have them. Whether there were variants in his time we cannot determine with certainty, as his text has clearly alone formed the subject of study. The other commentators all depend to some degree on him: Ānandatīrtha, in his own work, uses him, and Sayana uses both him and Ānandatīrtha. The evidence for the time before Śaṅkara is wanting. The later Upanisads borrowed their doctrines and phrases from works which were more developed and displayed more literary pretensions than the Aitareya, while the secular literature makes no direct quotations. All we can say is that the Mokṣadharma of the Mahābhārata and Baddarāyaṇa in his *Brahma Sūtra* (III, 3, 16, 17) probably used the Aitareya Upanisad,² but the next evidence is again Śaṅkara's commentary on those Sūtras.

Though strict proof beyond Śaṅkara cannot be attempted, there is no reason to doubt the integrity of the text of these books. They are not, in subject-matter, open to easy interpolation, and in all probability in their present form they fairly represent their original shape in the time of Śaunaka.

Nor is there any special reason to assume alteration in the verses which make up Book IV for which there is considerable independent evidence.

For Books I and V we have no earlier authority than Sayana. But he appears to have had before him a fixed text, and the various readings which he gives are practically limited to the last chapter of V, 3, the contents of which certainly lay it open to interpolation: yet Sayana of

¹ Cf. Max Müller, *S.B.E.*, I, 171 sq.; Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishads*, pp. 535 sq.

² Cf. Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, p. 78. English Translation, p. 29, and, for the Mokṣadharma, note on II 5.

course was not the first to write a commentary on the Āraṇyaka. He expressly refers, on V, 1, 1, to differences of interpretation, as to whether *tvasya abhivayasaḥ* (RV, X, 160, 1) meant four verses or one only according to rule, and on V, 3, 3, he refers to differences both of reading and of opinion. We are therefore justified in regarding the text he gives as practically a *textus receptus* by the fourteenth century A.D.

Whether or not it is original cannot be answered with certainty. Amongst others, Hillebrandt (*Sankhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, pp. x-xv) considers that the text of the Sūtras is much altered from the original, but in the case of the Āraṇyaka I, or V, it would be difficult to prove this doctrine, inasmuch as the Āraṇyaka seldom presents the truly remarkable variety of rules and exceptions shown by the present text of Sankhāyana. Further the text of the first book assists in checking the fifth book, and appears throughout to agree with it. Again in the former case, where the work is a true Āraṇyaka, the idea of later alteration is less probable than in a formless work like the fifth book, which is practically a Sūtra itself. Moreover, although a certain fluidity of text may be admitted in the Sūtras, the extent of such fluidity appears to be greatly exaggerated by Hillebrandt.

III The divisions of the Āraṇyaka and their date

There is some uncertainty as to the exact meaning of the word Āraṇyaka. Śāyana gives two somewhat different interpretations of it. In the preface to the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (Aufrecht's edition, p. iii) he describes it as *Aranyavratarupam brahmanam*; in the preface to the Āraṇyaka itself he says *Aitareyabrahmane 'sti kandaḥ Aranyaka bhūdhām | aranya eva pithyatvad aranyakam itirjate* § 5 and *sattra prakaraṇe nuktir aranyadhyajanaḥ hi | mahāvratasya satyatra kautram karma vivijate* § 8. The latter view is energetically supported by Oldenberg¹ and is adopted by Macdonell². The former has the support of Weber³ and Deussen⁴ argues in favour of it on the ground that the aim of the Āraṇyakas was to supply a substitute for the sacrificial rites to be used by Vānaprasthas. This view, however, is rather far fetched. The Āraṇyaka seems originally to have existed to give secret explanations of the ritual, and to have presupposed that the ritual was still in use and was known. No doubt the tendency was for the secret explana-

¹ *Prolegomena* i, p. 298

² *Indian Literature*, p. 28

³ *1111 septuaginta der Upanishad* 1, p. 3

⁴ *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 34

tion to grow independent of the ritual until the stage is reached where the *Āranyaka* passes into the *Upaniṣad*, and contemporaneously the life of the Hindu is differentiated into the four *Āśramas*. But originally an *Āranyaka* must have merely meant a book of instruction to be given in the forest.

It is not now possible to decide exactly why the *Āitareya Brahmana* does not deal with the *Mahāvratā* rite. In Sayana's time it was already held that the author of the *Āitareya Brahmana* was also the author of the *Āitareya Āranyaka*, Books I III,¹ and Sankara may conceivably have held the same view, as he calls the *Upaniṣad* the *Bahvṛcabrahmana Upaniṣad*.² It is however, impossible to accept this version as correct. It is probable enough that Mahidasa *Āitareya* is the editor or arranger of the *Āitareya Brahmana*, as Aufrecht thought. It is true that the *Āitareya Brahmana* is not in all probability the work of one hand or period,³ but it must have been at some early date welded into one work, and tradition may fairly be considered to have given us the name of the man who did it. We know from Panini V 1, 62, that in his day Brahmanas of thirty and forty *Adhyāyas* existed and Weber's⁴ conjecture that the reference is to the *Saṅkhayana* and *Āitareya Brahmanas* is almost certainly correct. But though we can fairly ascribe to Mahidasa the arrangement of the *Brahmana* it would be incorrect to ascribe to him even the first three books of the *Āranyaka* since in them he is cited as a teacher. He is named expressly in II, 1, 8 and 3 7, and is clearly referred to in I 1, 1.⁵ This must be taken as decisive⁶ against his authorship of these books of the *Āitareya Āranyaka* though it is clear that some of his views are expressed in them. We may perhaps suppose that Mahidasa besides editing the *Brahmana* was a philosopher of some distinction since otherwise his name would hardly have come down to us. Of his life we know nothing. Sayana tells us a legend of his being the son of

¹ See Aufrecht's edition of the *Brahmana* p 11. Max Müller *SBE* I cv.

² Max Müller *IC* p xc 1.

³ See Macdonell *Sanskrit Literature* p 23.

⁴ *Ind. An. Literature* p 45.

⁵ So Rajendralala Introduction p 8. Weber, *Ind. An. Literature* p. 48 and cf

Macdonell *Bṛhaddevatā* I xx:1 for a similar case. See also however Weber *Ind. Stud.* XIII 322 sq. according to whom Patanjali appears to allude to him self in the 3rd person. This however is less likely to be the case at so early a date as that of Mahidasa though later it is not rare.

Itarū; Ānandatīrtha, in his original commentary, describes him as the son of Viśāla and an incarnation of Nārāyaṇa. Perhaps there is some truth in the reference to him in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, III, 16, 7, and the Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, IV, 2, where he is said to have lived for 116 years, at any rate it shows that he was a famous sage and probably a real person.¹

The three books attributed to him can on internal evidence be divided into four parts. The **first book** consists of an explanation of the Mahāvratā from a ritualistic and allegorical point of view. It describes the different Śāstras of the morning, midday and evening libations of the Mahāvratā day of the Gavāmayana, a theme touched on in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 1-38, IV, 14, but indulges in further allegorical play of ideas. On the whole it bears a close resemblance in contents and style to the Brāhmaṇa, but it is doubtless more recent in date, or it would have been included in the Brāhmaṇa. Sāyana in his introduction to Book V calls it an *apauruṣeyaṃ brāhmaṇam*, and Śaṅkara calls the Upaniṣad similarly Bahvrcabrāhmaṇa Upaniṣad.

¹ The **second book** consists of two distinct parts. The first, comprising Adhyāyas 1-3, deals with the allegorical signification of the Uktha, that is the Nis̐kevalya Śāstra, three sets of eighty verses, which was the midday Śāstra of the Mahāvratā, as being Prāṇa or Puruṣa. It is not directly connected with Book I, and it is doubtless later than it. The second part comprises Adhyāyas 4-6, and is the Upaniṣad *par excellence*. It is probably later than part one.

The **third book** treats of the mystic meaning of the various forms of the text of the Samhitā, the *nirbhūya*, *prataraṇa* and *ubhayaṃantareṇa*, and of the vowels, semivowels and consonants. It quotes Māṇḍūkya and Śākalya among others, and makes use of the above terms to describe the *saṃhitā*, *pada*, and *krāma pāthas* of the Samhitā. These are so far signs of late origin, but at the same time the treatment of the subject-matter is at a much earlier stage than that reached by Yāska or the authors of the Prātiśākhya. It will be seen later that its philosophical view is more advanced than that of the Upaniṣad proper, and it can probably be dated about the sixth cent. B. C. This result is important,

¹ The references to Aitareya and Mahātareya in Śaṅkharāyaṇa Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 10, 3, and Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra,

III, 4, 4, throw no light on him, and are probably late; cf. Hopkins, *Great Epic of India*, p. 390.

as it gives us a lower date for the rest of the earlier books of the Upanisad

The fourth book consists solely of the Mahanamni verses. The presence of these verses is explained by Sayana on the ground that they must be studied in the forest. Their use is set forth by Āśvalayana in his Śrauta Sutra, VII 12 10, where he says that on the fifth day of the six day Prsthya rite after the Marutvatya Sastra, when the Niskevalya Śastra is being performed 'if the Udgatrs make the Sakvarasuman the Prstha Stotra then the nine verses called the Mahanamnis and certain *pūṛṣa padas* to fill up the lines, are to be used'. Tradition ascribes this Āraṇyaka to Āśvalayana. Sadgurusisya in his account of the works of Āśvalayana, says ¹ *dvadasādhyayakam sutram catuskam grihyam eva ca caturtharanyakam ceti hy Āśvalayanāsutrakam*. This view, however has been questioned in connexion with the authorship of the fifth book.

The fifth book consists mainly of a description in a Sutra style of the Niskevalya Sastra the great Sastra of the midday libation of the Mahavrata. It forms a sort of complement to Book I, which is the Brahmana as contrasted with the Sutra. The natural conclusion is, therefore, that Āśvalayana wrote Book V. The arguments² in favour of this view are (1) Book IV contains merely a collection of Mahanamni verses, it is not a Sutra at all and therefore Āśvalayana cannot have been its author. The reply is perhaps that the verses may have been collected by Āśvalayana and put into the Āraṇyaka in order that they might be available for being commented on in the Sutra and that it would therefore be natural to ascribe the Āraṇyaka to Āśvalayana. It is a sort of Āśvalayana Samhitā like the Sakala Samhitā. (2) It is argued³ that Sayana in the introduction to Āraṇyaka V, where he expressly ascribes that Āraṇyaka as contrasted with I to a Rsi uses the words *tasmad aṣṭasṭya*⁴ *samanujasjetyadid adasādhyajan maha tratasya pañcatimsatim ityadi pañcamaranyakam sutram eta*. This would no doubt be quite natural if Āśvalayana were the author of the Āraṇyaka but it is at least equally natural if Śaunaka was. (3) Colebrooke (*Essays*, I, 307) says, with reference to a Sutra of the Purva

¹ Max Muller *A Cent Sanskrit Literature* p 238, Macdonell, *Sanskrit* *manu* p 11

² See especially Oldenberg *S B F*,

VII, 134 sq. On p. 135 the words 'fifth and fourth' should be transposed

³ Cf. Rājendralala Introduction p. 10.

⁴ i.e. Śrauta Sutra I, 11

Mīmāṃsā 'It is, however acknowledged that a mistake may be made, and the work of a human author may be erroneously received as a part of the sacred book by those who are unacquainted with its true origin. An instance occurs among those who use the *Bakurich* a *sakha* of the *Rigveda*, by whom a ritual of Āśvalayana has been admitted, under the title of a fifth *Āraṇyaka*, as a part of the *Rigveda*' Rajendralala was unable to discover the source of this statement, and it seems probably to be a confusion of Āśvalayana with Saunika, or it may rather confirm the view of Sadguruśiṣya since IV could be confused with the *Rgveda* but not V. (4) The MSS I and G end *its Āśvalayanoktam Āraṇyakam samaptam*! This however, is a matter of no moment, and probably does not even preserve a tradition of Āśvalayana's authorship of Aranyaka IV. These two MSS, which are recent and inaccurate copies, and are probably ultimately derived from one original, contain collections of works attributed to Āśvalāyana and there is nothing surprising in the fact that they attribute the authorship of the Aranyaka to him. (5) Much more important is the fact which forms Oldenberg's second argument, that in his commentary on the Samaveda Sayana refers (I, p. 19) the authorship to Āśvalayana. But against this solitary reference¹ must be set the facts noted below. (6) There is undoubtedly great similarity between the two works Aranyaka V, and the Srauta Sutra. I think it certain that the author of the Aranyaka knew the Sutra. For example, in V 2 2 *ēṇa brahmanī tīsrak* stands without explanation, but as Sayana points out the verses referred to are given in Āśvalayana Srauta Sutra, VI 2 6. Again in V, 3 2, occurs *uktam vasatkaranumantranam*, which is not only a phrase used by Āśvalayana himself but is a clear reference to Āśvalāyana Srauta Sutra I 5 17². Further the vocabulary and syntax of the works is identical e.g. the use of *na va* in Āranyaka V, 3 1, as often in the Sutra e.g. VI 5 22, or the phrase *apsi vidarsanajodaharisyamah*, or the word *ekapatiṇjah*. These facts, however, which were not known to Oldenberg merely prove that

¹ But I do not feel sure as to the reference. The words are *bakurich* : *adhyaṅga mahāvratayogapratipādaka* : *Āśvalayanasmṛitam kṛtapaṇṭhaḥ* : *aranye dhiyavānāḥ śāśanam aranyakam* : *its vedatī ena tyavā aranti*, and there is

clearly some confusion between the Sutra and Aranyaka which discredits the evidence.

² Cf. also V, 1 5 *uktav ryan* : is not explained but is in the Sutra.

Saunaka knew and used Aśvalayana's work which indeed was only natural since the Sutra deals with the Agnistoma the *prakṛti* of the Mahavrata. It will be seen that this agrees perfectly with the native tradition handed down by Sadguruśiṣya.

There is therefore no sound evidence to ascribe the fifth Aranyaka to Aśvalayana, and Sadguruśiṣya's attribution to him of the fourth Aranyaka remains the most probable¹. For Saunaka's authorship of the fifth Aranyaka we have the distinct and repeated authority of Sayana. Colebrooke (*Essays* I 46) first pointed out that Aranyaka V, 2, 5 = cited by Sayana on the Rgveda I, 8, 1, as Saunaka's and Max Müller (*S B E*, I, xcvi) says that 'Sayana when quoting in his commentary on the Rgveda from the last books,² constantly calls it a Sutra of Saunaka'. Further, in his commentary on the Āitareya Aranyaka he repeatedly refers to Saunaka as the author of the fifth book. E.g. on I, 4, 1, he says *ata eva pañcama Śaunakenodīkṛtaḥ* and again *taś ca pañcama Śaunakena śākhantaram aśṛīṣṭa pañcītaḥ*. See also Sayana³ on I, 4, 2 (ter), 3 (bis), I, 5, 2 (quater), 3 (bis). These references beyond question show that to Sayana Saunaka was the author of the fifth Aranyaka. There is no conceivable reason why this work should have been ascribed to him unless it was his. Similar as the book is in language to the Śrauta Sutra, yet it is in style less compressed and more intelligible than that work. We have certain evidence that Saunaka did compose similar works for, in the introduction to his commentary on the Sarvanukramanī of Katyayana Sadguruśiṣya expressly records that he composed a Śrauta Sutra which he destroyed when his pupil Aśvalayana had written his Sutra. This tradition would explain the close knowledge of Aśvalayana's Śrauta Sutra, which as we have seen above, the writer of this book undoubtedly possessed. No doubt it is possible that he may eventually have been credited with the authorship of one of the works of his pupil,

¹ With reference to Oldenberg's remark (p. 137) that *Āśv. uliyanaśāstrīkaṃ* cannot refer to the Mahanamsa I would observe that the expression refers to the Śrauta and Gṛhya Sūtras with the Āraṇyaka IV thrown in.

² Book must be meant. Āraṇyaka IV cannot be quoted.

³ It may be noted that the reference in

the Śāmaveda commentary is probably not the work of Sāyana. His pupils no doubt did much of his so-called work. Cf. the case of the Atharvaveda. Whitney, p. lxxv. The fact that passages in the Śāmaveda commentary are identical with those in the Rgveda commentary is of course quite consistent with this view.

as has been shown to be the case by Professor Macdonell in the matter of the Brhaddevatā, but that is a mere possibility against which tradition is certainly strong. It is impossible to argue that in Śaṅkara's eyes the term *caturthas anyakam* covered the fifth book also, for the two are quite distinct and cannot ever have been combined into one book. Moreover it must be remembered that a Gṛhya Sutra by Śaunaka is referred to by Śaṅkara, and appears to have been known to Hemādri in the thirteenth century.¹ So there is nothing at all improbable in the ascription of the Aranyaka V to Śaunaka.

Now it is possible to throw some light on Śaunaka's date. The Brhaddevatā which is attributed to him, but is certainly not his but the work of a pupil—probably not far removed in date—is posterior to Yaska and anterior to the Sarvanukramanī of Kātyāyana. Kātyāyana, who is in all probability the author of the Śruti Sutra and the Vajisaneyi Anukramanī, is most probably anterior to Pāṇini, since the Sarvanukramanī shows forms earlier than Pāṇini's grammar approves (see Macdonell, *Sarvanukramanī*, p viii, *Brhaddevatā*, I, xxi, xxiii). The argument from the use of Vedic forms is no doubt not certain but the balance of probability is in its favour, and it has been maintained by Buhler (*S B E*, II, xl, *Z D M G*, XL, 527 sq) and Winternitz (*Hochschrituell* pp 13 sq) against the objections of Bohtlingk (*Z D M G*, XXXIX, 517, XLI, 669, XLIII, 598 sq).² Thus it appears that Śaunaka³ must be considerably older than Pāṇini. On the other hand, we must not push him too far back or else it would be difficult to explain how Śaunaka is not cited in Pāṇini. Further, Liebig in his *Pāṇini*, ch. iii has shown grounds for the belief that the Aśvalayana and Sankhayana Gṛhya Sūtras are in point of language closely connected in time with Pāṇini. It does not, therefore, seem necessary to allow more than 100-150 years between Pāṇini and Śaunaka, and the time may perhaps be shorter.

Pāṇini's date unfortunately is not yet certainly fixed. There is between him and Patañjali not only the Vartikas of Kātyāyana, but also

¹ Caland, *Ainenukt*, p 143; Hillebrandt *Pratya Litteratur* p 26.

² Buhler's results are accepted by Hillebrandt (*Pratya Litteratur*, p 24) Jolly (*Recht und Sitt* p 3) and Macdonell (*Sanskrit Literature*, p 259).

³ It may also be noted that the anu- stubhs of Śaunaka are of an early type the first pada sometimes ending in - - - - of Oldenberg *S B E* XXX xxxv. So in the Brhaddevatā (Keith, *J R A S*, 1906 p 6).

emendations of those Vārttikas by the Bhāradvājyas, Saunāgas, and others and perhaps a *Sloka-vārttika*, which certainly presupposes a considerable interval of time. Bhandarkar¹ has further adduced evidence of changes in the language and extension of geographical knowledge especially as regards the peoples and places of the south between Pāṇini, Kātyāyana, and Patañjali. Goldstucker² and Bhandarkar³ have adduced evidence to prove that Patañjali was a contemporary of Pūṣyamitra (B.C. 178-142) and Menander (B.C. 144-120) and wrote his *Mahabhāṣya* in or about B.C. 144-142. This result is by no means certain because even accepting as fixed Pūṣyamitra and Menander's dates,⁴ still in the first place the MSS. of the *Mahabhāṣya* do not all contain the passages in which the statements relied on occur, and in the second place it is always possible that the examples occurred in the *Sloka-vārttika* or in some other earlier source whence they were taken over bodily⁵ by Patañjali. It may even be argued that Patañjali is not earlier than the second century A.D. inasmuch as he seems to know the *r* vowel sign, and according to Chinese tradition this vowel sign was a discovery of Nāgarjuna's, and Nāgarjuna's date is possibly in the second century A.D. under Kamska⁶. The latter, however, is probably to be referred to the first century B.C., and it would be a mistake to lay much stress on this argument. The *r* vowel-sign may have existed in grammatical circles long ere Sanskrit inscriptions become usual. Further the *Rajataranginī*, I, 174, is an authority for the existence of the *Mahabhāṣya* in the reign of Abhimanyu of Kashmir, whose date is however now quite uncertain. But whatever be Patañjali's date, there seems little doubt that the examples which point to the time of Pūṣyamitra and Menander must be genuine and that they prove the existence of some commentary on Pāṇini in the middle of the second century B.C. Kātyāyana is assigned by Hsuen Tsang to 300 years after the death of Buddha, which taking the Chinese reckoning of the Nirvāṇa gives the

¹ *Journal Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society*, XVI, 269 sq.

² *Pāṇini*, p. 228.

³ *Ind. Ant.*, I, 299, II, 59.

⁴ Cf. Duff, *Chronol. of Ind.*, pp. 14-17. Hoernle and Stark, *Hist. of Inha*, pp. 39 sq. Vincent Smith (*Hist. of Ind.*, pp. 192, 193) arrives at a slightly earlier date.

⁵ Cf. Weber, *Indian Literature*, p. 224. V. Smith, I.C., ignores the force of this argument. Cf. Lévi, *Théâtre indien*, p. 314.

⁶ Kamska's date is most doubtful but see V. Smith, *J. R. A. S.*, 1903, pp. 164, Fleet, *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, p. 979, 1907, pp. 171, 1934 sq., Hoernle, *Osteology*, p. 8.

middle of the third century B C as his date. This evidence is not of great weight, but it is not improbably nearly correct.¹ Pāṇini cannot therefore be less than fifty years older than Kātyāyana and must at latest belong to about A.C. 300. The question arises whether this date cannot be put further back. The chief argument against doing so is the use of the word *Yavanāni* in Pāṇini, IV, 1, 49. Doubtless this means Greek (Ionian) writing, but it does not necessarily follow that the word dates from after the invasion of Alexander.² Indeed the probability seems to me against this being the case. For it is certainly remarkable that Ionian should be the name given to the Greeks if first made known to India through the invasion of Alexander, whose army was certainly in no conceivable sense Ionian.³ On the other hand, the Ionian name⁴ was evidently the great name in the ears of Persians, and of those subjects who were led into Greece on the expedition of Xerxes, and⁵ it must be remembered that the Gandarians were part of Darcios' empire and a contingent from Gandhāra, accompanied Xerxes on the Grecian expedition. If it is borne in mind that Pāṇini was a native of Gandhāra according to Hsien Tsang, a view confirmed by the references in his grammar,⁶ it will not seem far fetched to consider that it was most probably from the older tradition that the name *Yavanāni* was derived. In this connexion reference may be made to the theory of Burnell⁷ that the word *lipi* which occurs in Pāṇini, III, 2, 21, is borrowed from the Achaemenidean *dipt*, meaning an edict, a view not at all improbable, and one which supports the view here maintained that it was through the Persian conquest of Gandhāra that the word *Yavanāni* became familiar to India. Goldstücker⁸ argued, indeed, that *Yavanāni* referred to

¹ Cf Wackernagel, *Allindische Grammatik*, I, lx, Fritschel, *Prākṛit Grammar*, p 34; Liebh, op cit, ch II, *Vienna Oriental Journal*, XIII, 312, where he ascribes him to 150 B C, taking the references to Menander and Pusyamitra to be his.

² This view is held by Benfey, *Geschichte d Sprachwissenschaft*, p 48, n 1; Burnell, *Asiatic Grammarians*, p 44; Weber, l c, p. 221; Wackernagel, l c, p lix.

³ So in Arrian Ionia appears merely

as a province and Ionians as residents therein

⁴ We have for this the contemporary evidence of the Athenian Aeschylus and of Herodotus Cf also Busolt, *Griech Gesch*, II, 515

⁵ See Herodotus, III, 91, vii, 66.

⁶ Cf Weber, *Indian Literature*, p 218.

⁷ *South Indian Palaeography*, p 6. Cf Bartholomae, *Indog. Forsch*, III, 176; Wackernagel, *Allindische Grammatik*, I, 222

⁸ *Pāṇini*, p 16

Persian writing, but this view cannot be maintained. But Weber himself admits¹ that perhaps the name Yavana may have become known before Alexander's time through the Persian war in which the Indians served as auxiliaries. There is also a striking piece of evidence that Greek writing was known in North India before Alexander's time, coins have been found with Greek inscriptions of pre Alexandrian date.² Greek engraved gems of a pattern much earlier than Macedonian times have been found in the Punjab, and the caduceus was known in India by B.C. 325 at latest.³

I do not therefore consider that the evidence of *Yavanani* is conclusive as to Panini's date though it certainly shows that he cannot be earlier than the fifth century. Weber⁴ also argues that his use of letters as numerals is a proof of Greek influence, but it may be equally well a proof of Semitic influence or a mere independent invention, as indeed seems most likely from the fact that the use remains isolated. Weber's other arguments e.g. that from the date of Apisak⁵ rest on too slight a basis to bear serious examination. On the other hand, it is not possible to follow Goldstucker⁶ in referring Panini to a date before Buddha on the strength of *survano vate*, VIII, 2. 50, because Panini probably deliberately ignored Buddhism⁷ or perhaps lived when the influence of Buddhism had yet to become great. Bhandarkar⁸ refers Panini to the beginning of the seventh century B.C. dating Katyayana in accordance with the legend of the Kathasaritsagara in the fourth century B.C., but he does not meet the difficulty as to *Yavanani*, though his proposed date would in some ways suit the history of Sanskrit literature. On the whole I incline to fix Panini's date at about 400-350 B.C. Bohtlingk, in the introduction to his edition fixed the date at about 350 B.C., and Lassen⁹ assigned Panini to 330 B.C.

¹ See *Ind. Stud.* IV 89. Berlin *Monatsbericht* 1871 p. 616 n.

² Head quoted in Bühler *Palaeographia* p. 3.

³ *Vienna Oriental Journal* XIII 307. Fleet *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, p. 531.

⁴ *Indian Literature* p. 222 n. Goldstucker *Panini*, pp. 50-51.

⁵ *Ind. Stud.* XIII 375 n. On the other side Bhandarkar's argument from *Śāradā* is equally unconvincing. Cf.

Weber p. 302 n.

⁶ *Pāṇini* pp. 245-247.

⁷ Weber *Ind. Stud.* V 139 brings evidence that Pāṇini knew Buddhism. It is not quite conclusive but is very probable.

⁸ *Bombay Gazetteer*, I: 140 sq. The legend cannot be relied upon in any particular though accepted by V. Smith *Hist. of India* II 337 n. 2.

⁹ *Ind. Alt.* I. 177. *Ergebnisse* I, 2, 3, 4, 5.

If this date is accepted for Pāṇini it is necessary to throw the older Nātyāyana, and therefore Śaunaka, a little further back. Śaunaka may perhaps be assigned to about 450 B. C. or possibly even to 500 B. C., which would then represent the probable date of Book V of the Āranyaka, while the collection of Book IV would be a product of the same period, since the evidence goes to show that Āśvalāyana and he worked contemporaneously.

Now it will hardly be doubted that Books I-III are decidedly older than Books IV, V. This is clearly reflected in the native tradition preserved in Sāyana's distinction between the *apauruṣeyam* character of the first three books and their attribution to the author of the Brāhmaṇa. It is not possible to say how much this means. But it is at least probable that the latest part of the first three books, Āranyaka III, belongs to not later than 550 B. C. and the earlier parts may be dated between 700 B. C. and 550 B. C. It will be seen that there is probably a considerable difference in time between the first book, and the two sections of the second, so that 700 B. C. is not too early a date for Book I.

I do not think that these results need be regarded as in any way surprising. The Brāhmaṇa period, according to Max Muller, probably extended from about 800-600 B. C., and this view has the weighty support of Prof. Macdonell.¹ The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa cannot be far removed in date from the first book of the Āranyaka, but the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, which contains many borrowings from it, is in the opinion of Aufrecht² known to Yāska : Now Yāska is certainly anterior to Śaunaka and Pāṇini, for he is cited in the R̥gvedaprātiśākhya,³ the Brhaddevatā, and is apparently known to the Astādhyāyī. His date cannot, therefore, be reasonably placed later than 500 B. C. and it may go back to 550 B. C. ⁷ This date is confirmed by the character of the Nirukta which certainly is anterior to either the Prātiśākhya or Pāṇini. If, therefore, the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa was known to him,⁴ even that late work must be dated about

1904, p. 442) adopts 350 B. C. If a late date is adopted, then the question of finding a place for the Bhāṭya becomes more and more difficult, cf. *J. R. A. S.*, 1904, pp. 435 sq., 457 sq., and (for the date of the Epic) *ibid.*, 1906, p. 2; 1907, p. 682.

¹ *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 12, 202 sq.

² *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. vi.

³ Weber, *Indian Literature*, p. 41.

⁴ The argument is not certain. It is based on the fact that Yaska, Nirukta, VIII, 22, quotes Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III,

Persian writing, but this view cannot be maintained. But Weber himself admits¹ that perhaps the name Yavana may have become known before Alexander's time through the Persian war in which the Indians served as auxiliaries. There is also a striking piece of evidence that Greek writing was known in North India before Alexander's time, coins have been found with Greek inscriptions of pre Alexandrian date². Greek engraved gems, of a pattern much earlier than Macedonian times, have been found in the Punjab, and the caduceus was known in India by B.C. 325 at latest³.

I do not therefore consider that the evidence of *Yavanani* is conclusive as to Pāṇini's date, though it certainly shows that he cannot be earlier than the fifth century. Weber⁴ also argues that his use of letters as numerals is a proof of Greek influence, but it may be equally well a proof of Semitic influence or a mere independent invention, as indeed seems most likely from the fact that the use remains isolated. Weber's other arguments, e.g. that from the date of Apisaki,⁵ rest on too slight a basis to bear serious examination. On the other hand, it is not possible to follow Goldstucker⁶ in referring Pāṇini to a date before Buddha on the strength of *nirvano's date*, VIII, 2, 50, because Pāṇini probably deliberately ignored Buddhism⁷ or perhaps lived when the influence of Buddhism had yet to become great. Bhandarkar⁸ refers Panini to the beginning of the seventh century B.C., dating Katyayana in accordance with the legend of the Kathasaritsagara in the fourth century B.C., but he does not meet the difficulty as to *Yavanani*, though his proposed date would in some ways suit the history of Sanskrit literature. On the whole I incline to fix Panini's date at about 400-350 B.C. Böhtlingk, in the introduction to his edition, fixed the date at about 350 B.C., and Lassen⁹ assigned Panini to 330 B.C.

¹ See *Ind. Stud.*, IV, 89, Berlin *Monatsbericht*, 1871, p. 616.

² Head quoted in Bühler, *Palaographiæ*, p. 3.

³ *Vienna Oriental Journal*, XIII, 307, Fleet, *J. K. A. S.*, 1907, p. 531.

⁴ *Indian Literaturz*, p. 222, n., Goldstucker, *Pāṇini*, pp. 50-51.

⁵ *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 375, n. On the other side, Bhandarkar's argument from *Sanhita* is equally unconvincing, cf.

Weber, p. 302 n.

⁶ *Pāṇini*, pp. 215-217.

⁷ Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, V, 139 brings evidence that Pāṇini knew Buddhism. It is not quite conclusive, but is very probable.

⁸ *Dombey Gazetteer*, I, ii, 140-39. The legend cannot be relied upon in any particular though accepted by V. Smith, *Hist. of India*, II, 137, n. 2.

⁹ *Ind. Alt.*, II, 147, *Verapoo I. J. S.*, 4, 5.

If this date is accepted for Pāṇini it is necessary to throw the older Kātyāyana and therefore Sāṃnaka a little further back. Sāṃnaka may perhaps be assigned to about 450 B C or possibly even to 500 B C, which would then represent the probable date of Book V of the Aranyaka, while the collection of Book IV would be a product of the same period since the evidence goes to show that Aśvalayana and he worked contemporaneously.

Now it will hardly be doubted that Books I-III are decidedly older than Books IV, V. This is clearly reflected in the native tradition preserved in Śrīyana's distinction between the *apauruṣeya* character of the first three books and their attribution to the author of the Brahmana. It is not possible to say how much this means. But it is at least probable that the latest part of the first three books Aranyaka III, belongs to not later than 550 B C and the earlier parts may be dated between 700 B C and 550 B C. It will be seen that there is probably a considerable difference in time between the first book and the two sections of the second so that 700 B C is not too early a date for Book I.

I do not think that these results need be regarded as in any way surprising. The Brahmana period according to Max Müller probably extended from about 800-600 B C and this view has the weighty support of Prof. Macdonell.¹ The Aitareya Brahmana cannot be far removed in date from the first book of the Aranyaka but the Gopatha Brahmana which contains many borrowings from it is in the opinion of Aufrecht² known to Yaska. Now Yaska is certainly anterior to Sāṃnaka and Pāṇini for he is cited in the Rgvedapratisakhya³ the Bṛhaddevatā and is apparently known to the Astadhyayī. His date cannot therefore be reasonably placed later than 500 B C and it may go back to 550 B C.⁴ This date is confirmed by the character of the Nirukta which certainly is anterior to either the Pratisakhya or Pāṇini. If therefore the Gopatha Brahmana was known to him⁴ even that late work must be dated about

1904 p. 442) adopts 350 B C. If a late date is adopted then the question of finding a place for the Bha. becomes more and more difficult. *J P A S* 1904 pp. 435 sq. 457 sq. and (for the date of the Ep.) ibid. 1906 p. 2. 1907 p. 68.

¹ *Sa. skr. t. Literat. re.* pp. 12, 102 sq.

² *Aitareya Brāhmana* p. vi.

³ Weber *I. d. in Literat. re.* p. 41.

⁴ The argument is not certain. It is based on the fact that Yaska Nirukta VIII. 2 quotes Aitareya Brāhmaṇa III,

600 B C, and the *Āitareya Brahmana* must be earlier, even apparently including the last ten chapters which are later than the earliest portions of the *Brahmana*. Thus the *Brāhmaṇa* cannot well be placed later than 600-700 B C, and the *Āranyaka I* is not to be dated much later.

Further the early date of even the *Upaniṣad* portions in Books II and III appears to be only what is to be expected from the history of philosophy. The *Upaniṣad* doctrines there set forth are essentially earlier than the doctrines of the earliest Buddhism, which belong to the fifth century B C, and we shall see that the *Upaniṣads* probably belong to the earliest of the extant works (Sect V). Moreover, Buhler (*S B E*, II, xxvii) has pointed out that Apastamba (c. 300 B C) knows the Vedānta school, which presupposes the full development of the *Upaniṣad*, while Gautama (before 400 B C.) knows even the *Atharvasiras Upaniṣad*, which is cited also in the *Moksadharma* (MBh. XII 12864).

IV. The Mahāvratā ceremony, and the relation of *Āitareya Āranyaka I* and V to the *Śākhāyana Āranyaka*

Sāyana in his commentary on V 1, 1, tells us that there are three forms of the Mahāvratā ceremony, according to which it is a one day rite, or a part of an *ahina*, or the second last day of a *Sattra*¹. But he says that the *Sattra* form is the original or *prakṛta* of the others which are *vikṛta*. The *Sattra* differs from the *ahina* in that it requires that all engaged

8, as *yajñān dr atyāñ kavir gṛhītām sjaṭ tam manasā dhyāyē vasatī utīyam*. Now the *manasā* here does not appear in the original but only in *Gopatha Brahmana VIII, 4* *tas manasā dhyāyā vasatī utīyāt*. It is hardly open to doubt that the form found in the *Gopatha* passage must have been before Yaska's mind. For though it is not unnatural for the author of the *Gopatha*, or some other *Brahmana*, who borrowed the main body of his work from other sources, to alter his original by inserting *manasā*, yet it is improbable that Yaska would have made the quotation incorrectly, but for the existence of the alternative version. The instance does not amount to proof, and on

the other hand it may be argued, with Bloomfield (*J A O S*, XI, 375 sq., XI, 1, 11), that the *Gopatha* borrows from the *Vaitana Sutra* and so is very late. But even assuming that the borrowing from the *Vaitana* is real, yet it is more than possible that the text of the *Gopatha*, a very unimportant work, has suffered interpolation, or perhaps the *Gopatha Brahmana* as we now have it is a working over of an earlier *Brahmana* which itself borrowed from the *Āitareya*. But in any case the *Āitareya Brahmana* is unquestionably much older than Yaska.

¹ For the characteristics of *Sattras* see Hillebrandt, *Ritual Literature*, p 154, Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, V, 17, 92-335.

should be *dikṣita*, the Hotr being also the *yajamana*, and in that it extends even to a year. In the *ahina* the Mahāvratā is the tenth day of the Paundarika ceremony, but neither the *ekaha* or *ahina* form is of importance.

In the Sattrā form the Mahāvratā is the last day but one of the Gavamayana Sattrā which lasts the whole year, and no doubt represents in some way the year. Hillebrandt,¹ who has most carefully examined this question, concludes that considerable alterations in course of time took place in this ceremony. As it stood later and as it is represented in most of our texts, the two important days were the middle day, the Visuvat, and the last day but one, the Mahāvratā, corresponding to the Summer and Winter solstices respectively. But the Tandya Brahmana,² certainly an old work, refers to a view, which it disputes, that the Mahāvratā belongs to the middle of the year, and it is clear that Indra is the god *par excellence* of the Mahāvratā. It may be argued with some plausibility that Indra belongs to the beginning of the rainy season, or the middle of June, and certainly the rites of the Mahāvratā show traces of a popular origin, like the celebrations of the Johannistag in Germany.³ It is not impossible that at one time the Mahāvratā was the first day of the year, when, as the Āitareya Aranyaka, I, 1, 1, has it, Indra slew Vṛtra and became great, and Hillebrandt adduces as evidence of this the month Tisya as compared with the Avestan Tistrya, Sirius.

Once then, in any case, the Mahāvratā may well have been a day of popular festival and worship. The Visuvat day receives scant treatment in the texts, possibly, as Dr Friedlander⁴ suggests, because the ceremonies connected with that day were transferred⁵ to the Mahāvratā to help to wipe out the popular character of that rite. It is, however, simple to suppose that in the usual manner the Brahmanas seized upon

¹ *Die Sonnenwendfeste in Alt Indien*, Erlangen, 1889. Cf. also Weber, *Die vedischen Nachrichten von den Nakṣatra*, Berlin, 1862, II, 282 sq.

² IV, 10, 3.

³ Many examples of such ceremonies are collected in Frazer *Golden Bough*, 2nd ed. Oldenberg, *Religion der Veda*, p. 444, n. 1 does not accept this part of Hillebrandt's theory and it may be

pointed out that the Winter solstice is more naturally the time for rites intended in part to increase the sun's heat, cf. Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, pp. 196, 241 sq.

⁴ *Der Mahāvratā Abschnitt des Śaṅkhayana Aranyak* 1, p. 2, n. 5.

⁵ Liturgically the Visuvat is the *prārita* of the Mahāvratā.

Śāṅkhyāna Āraṇyaka.¹ When as time went on there was felt the need of a formal exposition of the rite as a whole since in neither the Aitareya nor the Śāṅkhyāna Āraṇyaka is the account of the rite intelligible as it stands in the case of the Aitareya, as we have seen, a Sūtra like book² was added by Śaunaka but in that very book³ the secret nature of the doctrine is reiterated with the greatest force. The case of the Śāṅkhyāna Āraṇyaka is different. No addition was made to the Āraṇyaka, so far as we now know it,⁴ but two books, XVII and XVIII, were added to the Śāṅkhyāna Śrauta Sūtra. These books were not commented on by Anartīya but by Govindī, and they cannot be regarded as forming part of the Sūtra at his date. In fact we have conclusive proof that to Anartīya the eighteenth, and doubtless also the seventeenth book, was an Āraṇyaka. For in commenting on Śrauta Sūtra, XIII, 14, 7, he quotes XVIII, 24-30 as an Āraṇyaka. This fact, the full significance of which does not seem to have been realized by Hillebrandt, supports his view, which was based on other considerations, that the two books are not more recent⁵ than the rest of the Sūtra. On the contrary it is at least as probable that they are older⁶ but the important consideration is that the Sūtra treatment of the material was still considered too secret for insertion in the Sūtra. We must therefore recognize that at one time the Śāṅkhyāna Āraṇyaka, in addition to the Brahmana treatment in Books I and II, contained a Sūtra treatment like Book V of the Aitareya. As Books III-VI of the Śāṅkhyāna contain the Kausitaki Upaniṣad and correspond to Book II of the Aitareya, and Books VII and VIII of the Śāṅkhyāna correspond in some measure to Book III⁷ of the Aitareya, it is not surprising that the Śrauta Sūtra treatment of the so called Books XVII and XVIII should have formed part of the Āraṇyaka.

On the other hand it was not felt that any special sanctity or mystery attached to the Udgātṛ or Adhvaryu's functions. These are described

¹ Books I and II.

² Book V. ³ V, 3-3.

⁴ Our acquaintance with the exact form of the Āraṇyaka is comparatively limited. Few MSS are extant. Cf. Weber, *Indian Literature* pp. 50, 132. Conell, *Kausitaki Upaniṣad*, Preface p. vii. *Reddick Catalogue*, No. 976.

⁵ Hillebrandt, *Ritual Literatur*, p. 25.

⁶ Or of the same date see my note, *J. R. A. S.* 1907, pp. 410-29.

⁷ Weber, *Verzeichnis der Sanskrit Handschriften der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, II, 5. Friedländer op. cit., p. 24. Book XII=XI 2, Book XIII=III 2.

in the Samhitās and Brāhmanas of the other schools¹ (see the Tandyā Brahmana, IV, 10, V, 1-5, Latyāyana Śrauta Sutra, III, 9-12, IV, 1-3, for the Udgātr, and for the Adhvaryu, Taittirīya Samhitā, VII, 5 8-12, Taittirīya Brāhmana, I, 2, 6, 1-7, Kāthaka Samhitā, XXXIV, 5, Satapatha Brahmana, IV, 6, 4, 1, VIII, 6, 2 3, X, 1, 2, 1, Kātyāyana Śrauta Sutra, XIII, 2, 17-4, 2, and scattered notices in Apastamba Śrauta Sutra, XXII, XXIII). It is worthy of note that in his explanation of the ritual Sayana freely quotes and follows Apastamba, as he does sometimes in his commentary on the Aitareya Brahmana.

The date of the Sāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, like that of the Aitareya, presents considerable difficulty. As the Aitareya Āraṇyaka with the Aitareya Brāhmana, the Sāṅkhāyana is closely connected with the Kausitaki Brahmana. Vināyaka, the commentator on the Brahmana actually, in one place,² reckons the Books I and II as XXXI and XXXII of the Brahmana, and there are clear references to the Brahmana in the Āraṇyaka, while several passages agree even verbally.³ But though these signs are so far clear evidence that the connexion is close, they tend also to show that the Āraṇyaka is dependent on the Brahmana, and this conclusion is strengthened by the fact that at the time of Panini (about 350 B.C.), there seems to have been known to him⁴ a Brahmana of thirty chapters, which Weber⁵ must be right in considering to be the Kausitaki. Therefore the Āraṇyaka must stand to the Kausitaki in precisely the same relation as the Aitareya Āraṇyaka to its Brahmana.

Now the relation in time of the Aitareya and Kausitaki Brāhmanas⁶ is still open to discussion. The evidence seems to me, however, decidedly in favour of the priority of the Aitareya though that priority is not in all probability a great one. (1) The Sāṅkhayana is a more elaborate work than the Aitareya, it is completed by treating of the Haviryajña as well as of the Soma sacrifice proper, giving the Agnyadhana, the Darsapurnamasa, and the Caturmasyani. It is more probable that the less systematic Aitareya is the earlier. (2) The Sāṅkhayana seems,

¹ Friedlander p. 6, n. 3.

² On Kausitaki Brahmana, V, 5.

³ Compare Āraṇyaka, I, 2, with Brahmana II, 1, XIX, 4, XXV, 3, 1, 4, with V, 9, 1, 5, with II, 1, &c.

⁴ V, 1, 62. ⁵ *Indian Literature* p. 45.

⁶ Cf. Macdonell *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 203, 206, Wackernagel, *Altind. u. Gr. Grammatik*, I, cxc, with whose views I do not agree.

as Weber¹ points out, to represent a fusion of the views of Paṅgya and Kausitaki, whereas these names are unknown to the Aitareya,² which appears to represent a less dependent point of view and to show more originality. (3) In point of view of style the Śāṅkhāyana is much more condensed than the Aitareya. This fact is open to various interpretations, but on the whole the most probable theory is that the older a work, the less condensed its style, though later again the style becomes freer. This argument, which is applied to the Sarvaṇukramanī and Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra by Prof. Macdonell³ appears to me to hold equally well in the case of the Brahmanas. (4) The use of unaugmented tenses is more frequent in the Aitareya than in the Sāṅkhāyana.⁴ In favour of the priority of the Sāṅkhāyana the only *prima facie* piece of evidence⁵ appears to be the argument from the use of the perfect as a narrative tense. Now I do not dispute the value of this criterion, as the evidence appears to me adequate that so far as Vedic is concerned, the history of the perfect is that of an originally present force, such as persisted in words like *aha* or *veda*, to a narrative use. The perfect in narrative is indeed known to the oldest language, but the growth of the narrative use is decidedly a mark of lateness, and is accepted as such by Wackernagel.⁶ But the facts of the case are that in the first thirty Adhyayas of the Aitareya the use of the perfect is usually that of a present and that it is only in the last ten that the perfect is used for narrative, whereas in the Kausitaki Brahmana there are nearly three perfects for every five imperfects. The narrative of Śunahśepa in Book XXXIII is carried on in perfects but it is universally admitted that the last ten Adhyayas are a later addition, since (1) they have no corresponding

¹ *Ind. an. Literature*, p. 46.

² According to Aufrecht's Index. Cf. Weber, l. c.

³ *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* I, xxii. This is borne out by the fact that Pāṇini who is probably later than Kātyāyana reaches a further degree of unintelligibility.

⁴ Aufrecht *Aitareya Brahmana* p. 429. The omission in the *Lite Jaiminīya Brahmana* is merely a MS. error. Whitney *P. A. O. S.*, May 1883 p. xi.

⁵ On the use of *as iṣṭa* *as i* in the

late Book VII with periphrastic perfect &c. cf. Whitney, l. c. The *Jaiminīya Brahmana* has no claim to be deemed early, cf. Oerel, *J. A. O. S.* XVIII, 1, 25, XIX, 1, 103.

⁶ *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xxx. Cf. Whitney, *Transactions Am. Phil. Ass.*, 1892, pp. 5-34. *Grammar*, p. 296, *P. A. O. S.*, May, 1891, pp. lxxv-xciv. Wackernagel is wrong in thinking that Whitney does not accept the use as a chronological criterion.

matter in the Śankhāyana, while the Sankhayana Srauta Sutra has a version of the Sunahsepa legend and (2) their subject matter is quite unconnected¹ with the functions of the Hotr at the Jyotistoma rite which is the main topic of the Aitareya. Deductions from the style of the Aitareya Brahmana taken as a whole are therefore very risky, and Aufrecht² has conclusively it seems to me, shown that the Taittiriya Samhita in Book VI, which deals with the Soma sacrifice, follows the Aitareya Brahmana, which has thus a just claim to rank as one of the earliest Brahmanas as it is of course indisputably older than the Satapatha Brahmana and the Taittiriya Brāhmana, the latter being admittedly later than the Samhita, which it was clearly composed in order to complete. It is worth noticing that that Brahmana contains in Book III the description of the new and full moon sacrifices which is omitted in the Samhita³ and it may be considered that this helps to show that the Sankhayana Brahmana in which these rites are treated is later than the Aitareya.

On the other hand no argument either way can be drawn from the prominence of Siva in the Śankhayana⁴ since Aufrecht has proved that even the Aitareya Śiva is the great god in his form of Rudra, just as he is in the Satapatha the later books of the Vajasaneyi Samhita and portions of the Atharvaveda. It must be recognized that the deity later known as Siva came at an early period to be the most prominent member of the Hindu pantheon and to represent that striving at pantheistic monotheism which in one or other of its forms is so characteristic of all the developments of Indian religious thought. It is probable that several conceptions have merged in the idea of the later Siva. Originally a god of the storm which destroys⁵ he later amalgamated with a god of the forest or wood⁶ or rather perhaps with the vegetation spirit which has been rendered so familiar by the studies of Frazer following Mannhardt. Possibly, too, traits of his character are derived from the idea of the evil powers of the spirits of the dead, as

¹ Cf. Aufrecht *Aitareya Brāhmana* pp. iv, v.

² Op. cit., p. vi; and in the Notes.

³ Cf. Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature* p. 180.

⁴ Cf. Weber *Indian Literature*, p. 45.

⁵ Cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology* p. 77.

⁶ Oldenberg, *Religion der Veda*, pp. 216-224.

suggested by v Schroeder,¹ who regards him as chief of the spirits of the dead. But at any rate he cannot be regarded as a late deity, just as Visnu also belongs to an early period. Another sign of the fact that no very great distance in time separates the two Brāhminas may be seen in the fact that both employ in essentials the same style and language. It is worthy of note that in both the base *enad* occurs in the nominative.²

It seems, therefore, practically certain that at least the first thirty Adhyayas of the Aitareya are earlier than the Kausitaki and the temptation is strong to assume that the fact that the Kausitaki has precisely thirty Adhyayas is due to an imitation of the Aitareya. If this is so then we would be sure that the last ten Adhyayas were later than the Kausitaki, a view itself extremely probable on the ground of contents and of the use of the perfect as a narrative tense. But even so the Brahmana as a whole of forty Adhyayas is older than Pāṇini.³ Further the Paingya, who is cited as an authority in the Kausitaki is, according to the Kāśika on Pāṇini IV, 3, 105, a *civāntana*, so that the Kausitaki, like the Aitareya, can claim considerable antiquity.⁴

If the Aitareya Brahmana is older than the Sankhayana, it is not unreasonable to expect the same relation to exist in the case of the Aranyakas. This certainly is borne out by comparison of the ritual described. It at least appears to have been deliberately modified to differentiate it from the ritual of the Aitareya. It is not of course conclusive that the Aranyaka itself is necessarily later, since the description of the earlier ritual may be the later, but there is nothing to suggest that this is the case, and the condensed style of the Sankhayana appears more modern than that of the Aitareya.

Even in the Brahmanas the ritual differences begin to appear. The Prauga Sastra at the Pratahsavana of the Agnistoma and of the Visuvat, following the model of the Agnistoma consists of Rgveda I, 2 and 3, in *gayatri* metre.⁵ In the Visuvat, according to the Kausitaki Brahmana,⁶ the Sastra is in *tristubh* metre, though the other form is mentioned as

¹ *Vienna Oriental Journal*, IX, 248.

Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1074 d.

² V, 1 62.

³ Cf Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 455.

⁴ Bergaigne, *Journal Asiatique*, VIII,

13. Aitareya Brāhmana, IV, 29. Kausitaki Brāhmana XIV, 5.

⁵ VIII, 3.

⁶ Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmana*, p. 429. As the Aitareya example occurs in VII, it is possible that it is a case of imitation. In VII, 17 the periphrastic perfect with *asa* occurs, a very late form.

more correct, and consists of verses from different hymns on the model of the Aitareya form. But most of the differences¹ occur in connexion with the most important part of the Āraṇyaka, the Mahaduktha Govinda, the commentator on the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, tells us² that the parts of the Mahaduktha are the parts of the human form and not of the bird form. This is borne out by the words used, *akṣā, bāhū, prahastakam*, and the omission of the *vyarah* and *pucham*. The bird form is the older, it is that of the fire altar and of the Mahavrata Sāman, and probably it is to the change of form that the confusion in the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka is due.

In the Aitareya the Mahaduktha is divided into parts corresponding to the body, neck, head, vertebrae, wings, stomach, then comes the food of the bird in the form of the three *asitis*, the *vaśa* hymn, and ten miscellaneous hymns called the *uru*. The Śāṅkhāyana divides the Uktha into the body, head with neck, the two sides, divided into shoulder, arm, and hand, the back, consisting of the *caturuttarant*, the food in the form of the three *asitis*, together with the *udara*. Then, as the beginning of the end, come the *tripadas*, which in the Aitareya form the tail, the *Aindragna sūkta*, the beginning of the *uru* in the Aitareya and a collection of disconnected groups of verses, *arapana, tristupakata*, &c. The explanation of this confusion seems to be³ that the human form had no *pucha* and required fewer verses for the *pakṣa*, and so the verses necessary to make up the total of 1,000 *brhatis* verses, required by the rite, were appended at the end. To the alteration in form is probably to be attributed the fact that the sides are composed of equal numbers of verses whereas in the corresponding Sāman one side has the Pañcadaśī, the other the Saptadaśa Stoma, and in the Aitareya one side has 101, the other 102 verses,⁴ probably, as Dr. Friedländer suggests, because in flight one wing of a bird appears longer than the other.

A similar complication is made in the case of the three *asitis*⁵. In the Aitareya the *gajatri* and *uṣṇih asitis* are composed of eighty *gajatri* and (with a slight exception) *uṣṇih trcas* respectively, while the *brhatis asiti* contains eighty *sato-brhatis* verses. In the Śāṅkhāyana the *brhatis asiti* consists of eighty *brhatis* and eighty *fragāthas* (*brhatis* and *sato-*

¹ Friedländer, op. cit., pp. 10-11.

² V III, 2, 1.

³ Friedländer, p. 11, who has discussed

very carefully this question.

⁴ I, 4, 2.

⁵ For the details see notes on V, 2, 3, 5.

brhati) The additional syllables are added to the *usnik asti* which is composed of *gayatri*, *brhati*, and *pragatha*¹ The priority of the Aitareya is quite clear Again in the Aitareya the hymns corresponding to the Brhat and Rathantara Samans stand on the right and left wings of the bird in the Śāṅkhayana they no longer correspond to the Sāmans in position, but are grouped at the end²

The apparently deliberate divergence from the Aitareya appears also in the treatment of the verses from the Rgveda used in the litanies For example, the *usnik asti* in the Aitareya commences with Rgveda VIII, 12 and 13, in the Śāṅkhayana the order is simply reversed Again in the *vara* hymn, VIII, 46, in the Aitareya only vv 1-20 are prescribed, since they alone are addressed to Indra, in the Śāṅkhayana³ the whole hymn, though vv 21-24 are a *dānastuti*, and vv 25-28, and 32 are addressed to Vayu Similarly at the evening Soma pressing the Aitareya used the Viśvedeva verses, 1-41, of Rgveda, I, 164, only, while the Śāṅkhayana improperly uses all the verses

There is yet another sign of the earlier character of the Aitareya, as far as its Sutra part at least is concerned The Sutra part of the Śāṅkhayana the so called Śrūta Sutra when mentioning⁴ the various improper rites, says *tad etat puranam utsanuam na karyam*! There can be no doubt that this is a clear sign of a more reflective and refined age

Further, the language of the Śāṅkhayana suggests a close relation with the Aitareya, which must either be due to a common source, or perhaps more probably to borrowing For example, in the Aitareya⁵ occurs *brahmatad ahar brahmanarva tad brahma pratipadyate*, in the Śāṅkhayana,⁶ *brahmatad ahar brahmanarva tad brahma samar dhyate* On the whole the priority probably lies with the Aitareya

If, as seems clearly the case the ritual of the Śāṅkhayana is more recent than that of the Aitareya an interesting question arises as to the relation of the Aitareya I to the Satapatha Brahmana VIII and IX in which the Mahavrata is treated The evidence⁷ available on this point is not decisive (1) In LV, 3, 3 19, occurs the expression *janḥ aptacaita-rūṁśat tau catvurimsau pakṣau* which certainly points to the equality of the *pakṣas*, and, possibly, to the human form as the object of

¹ II, 10.² II, 16.

consecutively

³ II 11 Vv 29, 31, 33 are also addressed to Indra but they do not run⁴ XVII 6, 2⁵ I, 2 2⁶ I 2⁷ Friedlander, op cit p 14

comparison as contrasted with the unequal and longer wings of the bird (2) In the same passage it is said *yam trayastrimśat sa vasah*, and, as we have seen above the thirty three verses of Rgveda, VIII, 64, are employed in the Sankhayana only, the Aitareya using but twenty (3) In the third verse of Rgveda, X, 120, corresponding to the body, the Aitareya, V, 1, 6,¹ omits the second half and fills up the gap with a pada from the verses for the right and left wings. The Sankhayana Sruta Sutra, XVIII, 14 7, omits the half verse, and puts nothing in its place, but puts the half-verse together with the second half of the verse called *nada*, Rgveda, VIII 69, 2, before the *dispadas*. Now the Satapatha, VIII, 6, 2, 3, refers to *andharcau*, which name fits better the case of the Śāṅkhāyana, with its two half verses existing independently, than that of the Aitareya, where two separate pādas (not half verses) are interpolated to make up one missing half-verse. Dr Friedlander holds that the other points² in the account of the Satapatha, which is far from being a clear one, seem to throw little or no further light on the matter, and it is quite possible that the Satapatha represents a version older than the Sankhayana. But he appears to have overlooked one or two indications which tell strongly against this theory. It is clear from Śatapatha Brahmana, VIII, 6, 2, 3, that the general arrangement of the Sastra in the Mahavrata was similar to that of the Śāṅkhāyana, the *vasa* hymn being followed by the *dispadas*, the *Amudragna sukta*, and the *atapana*. What is still more significant is that the *asitis* are clearly composed in the same way as in the Śāṅkhāyana, for the direction in Sankhayana Aranyaka, II, 20, to take twenty four sets of four syllables from the *lakubh pragathas* has a parallel in VIII, 6, 2, 3. Finally, the priority of the Sankhayana appears definitely established by the fact that in X, 4, 2, 19, the Satapatha distinctly condemns the use of seventeen priests, which, as Eggeling (*S B E*, XLIII, 348, n. 1) points out, is laid down by the Sankhayana Book X as undoubtedly of the same period as or at least not earlier than Books VIII and IX, and to argue from it to the date of these Books is perfectly fair. It would probably therefore be best to regard the Satapatha as exhibiting a version which is later than, but which does not

¹ Not, however, in I

² Eggeling, in his translation, *S B E*, XLIII, naturally followed the Aitareya,

the only source then available, but save in the points above noted, the Śāṅkhāyana does not help

necessarily follow throughout the Sāṅkhayana version, I do not think even that version would satisfactorily explain all the details of the Śatapatha

It does not of course necessarily follow that the Śatapatha is later than the Aitareya Aranyaka I, but on the other hand this result is by no means impossible. For by common consent¹ the Śatapatha is one of the youngest of the great Brahmanas. It is no doubt anterior to Pāṇini, and as far as the controversy² over the Sūtra, IV, 3, 10, yields any results it is that Kātyāyana considered that Yājñavalkya was a *purāṇa*, as opposed to a recent author though therein it seems he disagreed with Pāṇini. It is abundantly clear³ that the name Śatapatha was well known to Kātyāyana. But there is nothing inconsistent in this with the view that the Śatapatha in its present form may be younger than the Aitareya Aranyaka I. It will be seen in Section VI that grammatically the Aranyaka I-III is older than Śatapatha Brahmana, I-V, X, XII-XIV.

It is perhaps well here to mention a theory recently put forward by Dr Hoernle⁴. He points out that in Śatapatha Brahmana XII, 2, 4, 10, the word *grivāḥ* which occurs in Aitareya Aranyaka I, 3, 4, is used to denote the seven cervical vertebrae, whereas in the R̥gveda and Atharvaveda it seems to denote the throat or windpipe. This view must he argues have been derived from the medical school of Yājñavalkya's day that of Atreya and he refers to the fact that Indian tradition assigns both Yājñavalkya and Atreya to the time of Buddha, the sixth century B.C.⁵ Clearly much stress cannot be laid on this argument as far as it might be applied to fixing the date of either the Aitareya Aranyaka or the Śatapatha Brahmana XII. For though

¹ Cf. Macdonell *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 203, 217. The Jaiminīya may be younger of its use of *adhi* Whitney, *P. A. O. S.*, May 1883, p. 211.

² Weber *Int. Stud.* XIII, 443-444. *Indian Literature*, p. 130. Bühler *S. E. A. S.*, II, xxviii n., XII, xxxv. It seems usually to be considered that Kātyāyana was right. But the evidence seems rather the other way as Āpastamba calls Yājñavalkya's contemporary Śvetaketu an *atara* and this agrees well with

the theory here maintained.

³ Vārti La. on IV, 2, 60.

⁴ *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, pp. 918-919. It is hardly accurate to regard Yājñavalkya as the author of the Brahmana. His opinions are represented—in that fidelity we know not—in part only of it and even that part must have been written by his pupil as of Weber *Indian Literature*, pp. 120 sq.

⁵ For Buddha's date see Duff *Chronol. of India*, p. 6, and especially Fleet *J. R. A. S.*, 1904, pp. 301-355.

grivah in the former work no doubt refers to cervical vertebrae, as the context shows, yet the passage shows none of the detailed knowledge of the Satapatha (*grivah pañcadasa | caturdasa va etasam karukarani vijam pañcadasaṁ*), to which it is certainly prior, as we have seen on other grounds. But the tradition connecting Yajñavalkya with Buddha's date is probably inaccurate, for the Brhadaranyaka Upanisad must, I think, be counted as earlier than Buddha and yet it is later than the mass of the Brahmana, and Yajñavalkya is to it a figure of ancient fame while we are hardly yet in a position to decide the date or opinions of Atreya, since we can scarcely assume that Cṛaka represents him, through Agniveśa, with much accuracy. But it may be noted that the later date of the Satapatha is distinctly indicated by the fact that Apastamba¹ calls Svetaketu a contemporary of Yajñavalkya modern, while the Kausitī Brahmana which also² cites Śvetaketu shows again a connexion with the Śatapatha which denotes its posteriority to the Aitareya.

V The three Upanisads of the Aitareya Aranyaka

There is some doubt as to the exact designations borne in early days by the Upanisads contained in the Aranyaka. According to Max Müller,³ the distinction is between the Aitareya Upanisad properly so called which fills the fourth, fifth and sixth Adhyayas of the second Aranyaka and the Mahaitareya Upanisad also called by a more general name Bahvrca Upanisad which comprises the whole of the second and third Aranyakas. There is no doubt that the term Aitareya Upanisad especially belongs to II 4 6 but the term Mahaitareya or Bahvrca brahmana Upanisad, though it sometimes⁴ applies to both Aranyaka II and III, sometimes⁵ is confined to Aranyaka II. Further the form, Bahvrca brahmana Upanisad is in the Anandasrama edition given to the Upanisad itself, while on the other hand, in one of the MSS in the Bodleian⁶ the second book is described simply as Aitareya Upanisad. Clearly the nomenclature was not definitely fixed. Book III bore the

¹ Bühler *S B E*, II xxxviii

² XXVI, 4

³ *S B E* I xcvi

⁴ e.g. in Winternitz and Keith *Calendar of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* No 1011

⁵ Winternitz *Poal Asiatic Society Catalogue* p 216

⁶ *Catalogue* No 1014. Deussen *Sech Upanishads*, p 13 is incorrect as to Sankara's view

special title of *Saṃhitā Upaniṣad* which is given to it in Śaṅkara's commentary and which it claims for itself by its opening words. The term *Mahaitareya* may have been applied at an early date since it appears to have given rise to the fiction of a *Rṣi*, *Mahaitareya*, by the date of the composition of *Aśvalayana Gṛhya Sūtra*, III, 4 but the text of these *Sūtras* is not very certain.

It must be recognized that the interpretation of these *Upaniṣads* is far from certain or easy. They were no doubt originally accompanied in the Vedic schools by explanations which might, had they been preserved, have shown how much we now misinterpret them. But it is impossible to regard Śaṅkara's explanations as traditional. There must have been somewhere a gap in the tradition. This is shown clearly by the fact that Śaṅkara explains all the *Upaniṣads* as exhibiting one doctrine, an impossible view, and that *Baḍarayana*¹ who in his *Brahmasūtra* does precisely the same thing adopted a different doctrine as the fundamental key to the system. All that can now be done is to take the *Upaniṣads* and endeavour to extract what seems the most natural meaning from the actual words.

In the eyes of Śaṅkara and Śāyana there is no difference in time nor in essential doctrines between the three *Upaniṣads* which they regard as one. (There are three classes of men says Śāyana² in the Introduction to Book III, those who desire immediate freedom through the knowledge of Brahman, and accordingly find it by aid of Book II 4-6, those who desire to become free gradually by attaining to the world of *Hiranyagarbha* for whom II 1-3 is intended, and those who care only for prosperity, for whom the third *Aranyaka* serves. In the Introduction to II, 1, 2, he adds that it lays down aids to the concentration of thought in the shape of the performance of certain *upasanas* or meditations. Such meditation may be of two kinds, *Brahmopāsana*, or *Pratikopāsana*, the former consists in contemplation of Brahman as endowed with qualities, the latter in considering worldly objects as Brahman whether, as in the second Book, they are sacrificial objects or non sacrificial.)

It is undoubtedly the case that the *Upaniṣad*, II, 1-3 is intended in some degree to supersede sacrifice or rather while assuming sacrifice to

¹ See Thibaut, *S B E*, XLVIII, 1c th
I & A S., 1906 pp 40p 59.

S B E I, 200. It is true he follows Śaṅkara, but they are not Śaṅkara's actual words.

² Śaṅkara, according to Max Müller,

explain it mysteriously the mystic meaning being the essential part. The path *par excellence* is knowledge of the real meaning of the Uktha. Uktha = earth, sky and heaven, its objects are Agni, Vayu and Aditya; its *abits* are food, whereby all is obtained. It is also the body, mouth, nostrils, and forehead of Prajāpati. The breath is Uktha and *sattya* and as *brhati* supports all things. Purusa II, 1, 7, again creates the earth, fire, the sky, the air, heaven and the sun.

In Adhyaya 2, Prāna is identified with the authors of the hymns of the Rgveda, the *res*, the *ardharcas*, and Indra declares himself to be Prana, and, II, 2, 4, the worshipper is identified with the sun.

In Adhyaya 3 the identity of the individual and the Uktha or Prana is insisted upon. The growth of self is traced from the sap of herbs and trees through animals which show hunger and thirst, to knowledge in man and after the identification of Uktha and Prāna the Adhyaya ends with some obscure verses alleged to treat of the winning of Hiranyagarbha.

The precise meaning of the doctrine is hard to decide. It appears however, to amount to a vague pantheism, which recognizes the unity of all existence physical or otherwise, and at the same time tends, as pantheistic views naturally do tend, to become a cosmogonism, especially in the account of the powers of Purusa (II, 1, 7). It is too early yet to speak of a clear differentiation of mind and body, though distinct signs appear in II, 3, 2 where men, animals and trees are regarded as showing in inverse order the growth of intelligence. But the Prana or Purusa does not consist in mind as opposed to body; all things exist in him and both mind and body seem equally essential elements.

Deussen in *Die Philosophie der Upanishad* s¹ argues that the oldest Upanisads are dominated by a doctrine derived from Yajñavalkya which may be styled 'Idealism' and which may be summed up in the propositions (1) the Ātman = the knowing subject within us, (2) the Ātman = itself as subject unknown, (3) the Ātman is the sole reality. These propositions undoubtedly are found in the Brhadaranyaka Upanisad I-IV, and I agree with Deussen in thinking that they were taken over and partly misunderstood by the Chândogya Upanisad and that the Taittirīya and Kausītaki Upanisads are probably later still.² Nor as

¹ Pp 209 sq., 357, E. T., pp 231 sq., 397 sq.

² *Ibid*, pp 23-24. E. T. pp 23. The Kausītaki Upanisad, it may be noted,

stands in no organic relation to the Kausītaki Brahmana unlike the Aitareya Upanisad see Lindner, *Kausītaki Brahmana*, p. ix. This goes to prove its later date.

other three doctrines, which naturally lead to the recognition that no such thing as transmigration can exist, and that mere knowledge is freedom and there is no consciousness after death.

The question arises how far these doctrines have any counterpart in II, 1-3. The answer seems that the Upanisad stands in regard to them all on an earlier plane of development. (1) The Ātman is not yet recognized as the unity. That is designated as *Prana* or *Puruṣa*, and in II, 3, 2, the *Puruṣa* has an *Ātman* which is developed in various degrees in the *Puruṣa* according to the diverse forms which *Puruṣa* adopts as man, beast, plant, &c. There is a pantheistic conception, but it is not one of consciousness as the sole reality. (2) There is naturally no trace of the doctrine of the unknowableness of the Ātman. (3) What is more important, there is no trace of the doctrine of the unreality of things. *Puruṣa* exists in them all, but either he is identical with, or creates (II, 1, 7) them, and he does not exist outside them. The nearest approach to a hint of the later idea is found in II, 1, 5, where it is said that if one knows what is *Satya*, then even if falsehood is spoken by him, yet he says what is true. But it is only a vague hint. (4) The doctrine of transmigration cannot be proved to be known to this Upanisad. *Sankara* and *Sayana* of course assume its existence but the passages can be explained otherwise. They are II, 1, 3, *tad idam karma kṛtam ayam puruṣaḥ* which most probably means that action is the man, a man is what he does, not a man is what he did in a former birth, which is not really suitable in the context, and 3, 2, *jathaprajñam lu sambhavaḥ*, which I take to signify 'for their experiences are according to their intelligence, a meaning which avoids dragging in a doctrine by no means needed or even intelligible in the context. The doctrine of the Upanisad is immortality in another world with the gods, II, 2, 4, &c.

There appears therefore no legitimate room for doubt that the Upanisad, II, 1-3, is anterior to the spread of the *Yajñavalkya* doctrine and to all subsequent Upanisads which contain that doctrine. Parts of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* and *Chandogya* Upanisads may be equally early, for some of their texts contain no reference to transmigration, but it would seem that *Aitareya Aranyaka* II, 1-3, which forms a unity, is the oldest long Upanisad extant.

In the Upanisad proper, II, 4-6, there is clear evidence of a further development of doctrine. In *Adhyaya* 4 the idea is that the Ātman

produces everything, cosmogonism in fact. In Adhyaya 6 we reach the identifications of Prajāna with Brahman and these two with Ātman. We thus have clearly the doctrine that the Ātman is consciousness, for it is intended evidently not to identify reality with the Ātman, but, as in Adhyaya 4, in a rough way, to show that all things—the gods, the elements, men, animals, &c., are dependent on knowledge that is the Ātman. But there is still no statement that the self is unknowable, that is, the conception of subject as contrasted with object is not yet clear. On the other hand the sole existence of the Ātman appears in II, 4, 3 where it is asserted that there is no other self. But this view carries with it no denial of the reality of things which depend on Ātman. The Mayā conception is not even implicit. Nor is the doctrine of transmigration apparently present. It is true that Śāṅkara and Sayana found it in II, 5 *aitihasyāṁ itara atma kṛtakṛtyo vajogatah praiti sa itah prayann eva punar jayate tad asya trtiyam janma*! But *itah* must mean 'hence' and the third birth must be in the heaven, an idea of course familiar to the Brahmanas¹ which know nothing of transmigration.

There is not, therefore, anything in my opinion in this Upanisad to justify us in assigning it to a later date than the period anterior to the main doctrines of the Brhadaranyaka.

In the third Upanisad, III, 1-2 there is little of philosophical interest. There is a repeated identification of the incorporeal conscious self and the sun, and there is a distinct assertion that the self is that which hears, thinks, sees, &c., but is not heard or thought, and which is within all beings. This gives us (1) the conscious Ātman which (2) is not knowable and (3) probably is all that is real. But there is no sign of the doctrine of Maya, nor of transmigration nor of freedom in knowledge. On the contrary the fate of the good is repeatedly stated to be prosperity in this world and Svarga in the next. So even this Upanisad may be earlier than the Brhadaranyaka Upanisad.

External evidence for the dates of the Upanisads is not forthcoming. It is true that the first Upanisad presupposes that the Rgveda was already arranged as we have it at the time when the Upanisad was composed but Oldenberg² has shown that the Rgveda assumed its present

¹ Deussen op. cit., pp. 294-295, E. T., pp. 326-327, Macdonell *Vedic Mythology*, p. 169.

² In his *Prolegomena* and cf. his review of Scharfstein's *Die Apokryphen des Rgveda* in *Gott. Gel. Anz.*, 1907, pp.

in II 6, in comparison with the Aitareya account in II 4, 3, is quite inconclusive. Further, the Taittiriya Upanisad² sets a high value on asceticism, and thus differs from the Aitareya and even the Bṛhadaranyaka and Chandogya. Historically the earliest view appears to have been opposed to asceticism, which only later was regarded as an aid to knowledge. Again in the Śikṣavallī the knowledge of grammar shown is at least as great as that of the Samhitā Upanisad. Another sign of the comparative lateness of the Taittiriya³ is the addition of *māhas* to the triad, *blūr*, *bhūrah* *śar*.

There can, in any case, be no question of the priority of the Aitareya to the Kausitaki Upanisad. The Kausitaki is decidedly late.⁴ Adhyaya I is a variant of the transmigration legend found in Chandogya, V, 3-10, and Bṛhadaranyaka, VI, 2, which are both late passages in their Upanisads.⁵ The twelve explanations of Balaki Gargya in the Bṛhadaranyaka, II, 1, are expanded to sixteen in Kausitaki IV.⁶ The *pranasamvada* of the Aitareya, II, 4, is certainly older than either that of the Bṛhadaranyaka, VI, 11-14, or the Chandogya, V, 1, or the Kausitaki, II, 12-14, III, 3. The name, *udṛiṣṭa* for the organs of sense first occurs in Kausitaki II 15,⁷ and in Aitareya III, 2, 1, and the word *manas* occurs in the sense of an organ, like speech, sight, hearing, instead of the old sense 'consciousness,' in Kausitaki, III.⁸

* Further it may be noted that in the Aitareya, even in III, 2, 3 there is no hint of the recognition of the Atharva as a fourth Veda. Such hints occur in the Bṛhadaranyaka, V, 13 and VI, 4 13, and Atharvāna occurs in Chandogya, VII, 1, 2, while the Atharvans and Angirases are mentioned in the early text, Bṛhadaranyaka, II, 4 10.

Other Upanisads, including the Jaiminiya Upanisad Brahmana, may fairly be left out of account. None of them can claim to be older than the Aitareya and many must be much more modern. They are marked by a greater formalism of doctrine, accompanied by attempts to graft popular doctrines on to the philosophical conceptions of the Upanisads, which were apparently soon found too abstruse for the comprehension of their successors.

¹ 15² Op. cit., pp. 64, 65, E. T., pp. 67-69³ Cf. supra, p. 42, n. 2.⁴ Deussen, op. cit., pp. 296-97, E. T.,

pp. 334-34

⁵ *Ith I*, p. 80, E. T., p. 87⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 244, E. T., p. 270.⁷ *Ith I*, p. 245, E. T., p. 272

It may therefore be concluded that the first two Upanisads certainly, and probably also the third, precede the Brhadaranyaka and Chândogya Upanisads in their main portions, especially the Yājñavalkya section of the former, that they are pre-Buddhistic, as is proved both by the contents and the language,¹ and that they date from about 700-500 B.C.

In connexion with the relation of the Upanisads to Buddhism it may be well to trace the history of the Ātman doctrine. The derivation of the word is in dispute² and throws no clear light on the meaning. But at any rate, it is certain that the Indians obtained gradually, doubtless through the phenomena of dreams and swoons and death, the conception of the body being animated by a soul. This conception naturally reacted on their views of religion. It is impossible to suppose, as is now so often done, that the earliest or even an early form of religion was the belief in spirits which take up their abode from time to time in various forms. It cannot have been until after long experience that the idea of a disembodied spirit can have been intelligible. Primitive man must long have regarded body and mind as one. So his earliest worship must have been addressed to things which seemed to him to be able to help or hurt him. We cannot believe with Rhys Davids³ that the early worship of trees was really dryad worship. The early believer regarded certain trees as divine, just as he regarded certain animals, like the cow or the snake, as divine because of their beneficent or maleficent powers, and it was only later that the idea of the spirit as separable from the tree or animal appears. Once the idea of a separate spirit is arrived at of course the nature of the deity changes, anthropomorphism arises, or other animals or things than that which the deity originally was become his place of abode⁴. Further, other abstract deities can arise, and we pass from worship of natural objects to worship of spirits embodied from time to time in natural forms. It was not unnatural that the thinker should endeavour to find some common explanation of the vast world of souls, and still less unnatural that he should decide that all souls were identical,

¹ Liebhich, *Panini*, ch. 10, concludes that the language of the Brhadaranyaka is pre-Paninian. This incidentally supports the theory of the date of the Aitareya.

² Cf. Deussen *Philosophie d's Veda*, p. 285; Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, III, 116.

³ *Buddhist India*, p. 226. Cf. Oldenberg's view of early religion, *Religion des Veda*, p. 37.

⁴ Hence the fetishism described in Farnell, *Evolution of Religion*, pp. 44-47, and cf. my article, *J. R. A. S.* 1907, pp. 929-949, on theomorphic deities.

■ subject, and it is no answer that there need be no permanent individual self

The doctrine of *anatta* therefore destroys all the basis of *samsāra*, and ■ complete proof that Buddhism is entirely dependent on the Upanisads which first clearly develop that view. There are numerous other signs of dependence. The dialogue form is copied from the dialogues of the Bṛhadaranyaka and Chandogya, and even the style of the Aitareya Upanisad, II 6 *3 ad etad hrdayam manas castat samjñanam ajñanam vijñanam prajñanam madha distir dhrtir matir manīṣa juteḥ smrtih samkalpah kratur asuh kamo vasa iti sarvaṇy evaṣṭani prajñanasya nama dhīyāṇi*, is a forecast of those intolerable lists of practically meaningless synonyms which disfigure the pages of the Pali Suttas. In estimating the causes of the fall of Buddhism,¹ it must, I think, be recognized how great a part was played by the unphilosophical and uncritical nature of the metaphysical doctrine, and by the elaborate mass of inaccurate and fanciful psychology,² which the school endeavoured to set up as its contribution to the knowledge of truth. The Upanisads contain much that is foolish and meaningless, but they are the first books of a new faith and were fated to be the sources of a system of philosophy whose influence in India is still paramount.

It follows with certainty that the Aitareya Upanisads are considerably older than Buddha, whose date of death is certainly about 487 or 477 B C.³ We must therefore probably fix 600 B C as the lowest limit for their composition, or put 550 B C at the very latest thus modifying slightly the results above reached. It is not possible to estimate how quickly thought then worked, but about 50 to 100 years will be required for the development from the earliest to the latest Upanisad, and I incline to fix approximately the dates at from about 700-600 B C for Aranyaka II, and 550 for Aranyaka III. Aranyaka I may be somewhat earlier, but not necessarily much earlier, while, as seen above, the Āranyakas IV and V belong to about 450 B C, thus explaining the dictum of Sayana which distinguishes so sharply between the two parts. The upper date may

¹ Cf Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, pp 319-320

² Mrs Rhys Davids in her *Buddhist Psychology* has done much for the study, but the fact remains that it is not worthy

of the labour bestowed on it. Cf Hopkins, *J R A S*, 1906, p 581, Louis de la Vallée Poussin *J R A S* 1906, p 944

³ Cf p 37, n 5

from the Samkhya may be yet it is clear that it was from the Samkhya that Buddhism derived its theory of the soulless entity which yet goes through transmigration. For this is precisely the *lingasārī* which alone migrates, *purusa* being a truth utterly dissociated from matter. From this point of view also is reached the result that the Aitareya is considerably anterior to Buddhism.

Aranyaka I contains, in comparison with the Upanisads, little of philosophic interest. It is important, however, to observe that in it *brahman* appears already as a principle of unity. In I, 1, 3 *gajatri* is identified with *brahman* and the Mahavrata day is also identified, because it leads to *brahman*. Similarly *Vasukra* is *brahman* and so is identified with the Mahavrata day. There can be no doubt that the *brahman* conception is older than that of the Atman, and that it originally meant the power of prayer, which even in the Rgveda is treated as a spell to bend the gods by its own force to grant what is craved, instead of being considered an appeal to the lovingkindness of the gods. That eventually this doctrine was amalgamated with a younger rival, the Atman doctrine, as Oldenberg suggests seems to me undoubted. The assimilation is seen complete in the Upanisad II 6 which indicates the length of time which we must assume between the first book and the Upanisad proper.

It remains to consider whether any explanation can be given of the connexion with the doctrines of the Upanisad of the Mahavrata rite. Some light on this matter is thrown by Prof Eggeling in the introduction to Part IV¹ of his translation of the Satapatha Brahmana. He there points out that the Agnicayana and the Mahavrata appear to have been developed in connexion with a doctrine of the production of the world from the sacrifice of Purusa (cf Rgveda, X, 90) which eventually yields the equation of Prajāpati at once to the sacrifice and the sacrificer (cf Aitareya Aranyaka, II, 1, 2). But the sacrifice lasts a year and so Prajāpati becomes time and death, and eventually mind. Thus the Mahavrata rite is treated in the Aranyaka as specially secret and finds a natural development in the more purely philosophic Upanisads.

In conclusion, a few words may be said as to the relation of Aranyaka III to the other Vedic texts of similar content. It is of course very closely related to the Śāṅkhayana Aranyaka VII, VIII, with which it agrees verbally in some parts, showing that both versions go back to

¹ S B E, XLIII xi : xxvii

■ not very distant common ancestor. But on the whole the version of the Śāṅkhāyana seems the more modern in several respects¹

The Samhitopaniṣad Brāhmaṇa ■ certainly a much more recent work. Burnell, in the preface to his edition, has urged general considerations for its comparatively late date. It shows a considerable advance of phonetic science, and mentions such points as *lopa*, *atikhara*, *rephasandhi*, and *visargopagraha*, while it deals with the *śvaras*. Three sorts of Samhita are distinguished, the *deva*, *asura*, and *ṛṣi*, an artificial conception. The Samhitā ■ also considered as *juddha*, *aduhṣṛṣṭa*, and *anirbhinna*. In the last section philosophy has degenerated into meaningless formulae, and the demand for gifts in Section IV is beneath the dignity of the older Aranyakas and Upanisads. Nor is it without significance that in so short a text are found *sukhubhavaṭi* and *gulmibhuta*, forms rare indeed in the older texts² while the only narrative tense found is the perfect³ (in III) and the language is classical.

The Āranyaka III is also in all probability older than Taittirīya Upaniṣad, I, 3, which appears, as will be seen from the note on III, 1, 2, to be an enlarged version of the older Samhita doctrine, although it seems likely that the Upaniṣad is much older than the Samhitopaniṣad Brāhmaṇa.

VI Style and Grammar

In this connexion it will be sufficient to consider the first three Aranyakas as forming one whole as distinct from the fifth Aranyaka, and to disregard the differences in date among their parts. The quotations contained in the fourth Āranyaka, and also scattered throughout the rest of the work, may be left out of consideration until later (p. 74).

The prose of the Aranyaka is of considerable historic interest. The history of Sanskrit prose is one of continual degradation so far as the grammatical structure of the language is concerned. Classical prose, whatever the subject matter, whether romance, ■ in Subandhu and Bana,

¹ I have had available for comparison the MS. Sansk. ■ 2 of the Bodleian Library, described in Winternitz and Keith's *Catalogue* pp. 39, 60, and, as I fear Dr. Friedländer will not carry out his projected edit. on, I have not refrained

from quotation from the text.

² Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1093, 1094.

³ Cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xxxi, n. 2.

clauses takes the place of due subordination, and an inordinate love for parallelism of structure is the chief sign of conscious literary effort (cf II, 1, 4, 4, 3). There is no power of transition from thought to thought, and in other cases it is difficult to tell whether it is the thought which is defective or the language which has failed to express it (cf e.g. II, 1, 2 *na tasjete jan nadyad jad rannam nadynti*, II 1, 5 *na tasjete jan mahyam na dadynti*). Some defects it shares with all Sanskrit prose. Although it has at command a considerable range of particles it fails to use them with any clear discrimination of sense, thus contrasting with the analogous phenomena in Greek literature where a delicate discrimination in the use of particles runs on from Homeric into classical Greek. Again, although it commands a wide range of pronominal forms they are not used with any clear difference of sense, and indeed a characteristic of the *Āitareya*, as of all Brahmana prose, is the use of double pronouns, like *sa esa*, without the slightest real difference of sense from the single pronouns. The same result, lack of precision, arises from the free use of the cases of the noun and the absence of prepositions to define exactly the sense intended.

But utterly lacking as is the style in precision balance and elegance, and although the *Aranyaka* is destitute of any attempt at ornament, it has nevertheless a certain fitness to its subject matter. The naïve speculations, the vague guessings after truth, the confusion of thought, which make up the matter, are not inadequately mirrored in the harsh abruptness and elliptic brevity of the style and a certain variety is introduced in the frequent quotations of verses intended to bear out the argument.

The historical position of the prose is not open to serious doubt. It cannot be contemporary with the classical prose of the *Kavya* type, and it is clearly anterior to the prose of the *Sūtras*. This is shown not merely by the disuse in the *Sūtras* of various grammatical forms still found in the *Aranyaka* but still more by the form of the *Sūtras*. The *Aranyaka* is written in prose as a literary composition, other *Sūtras* consist merely of strings of rules, and though as Dr Knauer in his edition of the *Gobhīṣya Gṛhya Sūtra*, and Hillebrandt in his edition of the *Sāṅkhayana Śrauta Sūtra* have shown they can be construed as texts written continuously, still such compositions must be later than original prose works. On the other hand, not only does the *Aranyaka*

contain fewer grammatical antiquities than the *Āitareya Brahman*, but it is written in a more developed style and with a greater approach to a command over the language.

The style shows also interesting affinities with that of the Buddhist Pāli Sūtras. It is impossible not to recognize in both the same long lists (e.g. II, 6) of names of mental phenomena, in which thought is hidden under meaningless verbal distinctions. Similar in both is the affection for parallelism of structure and the remorseless love of completeness which insists on repeating in every detail ideas applicable to more than one subject in every instance in which they apply, while the set formulae with which the Pāli Sūtras open and close have close parallels in the *Āraṇyaka*.

On the whole the vocabulary of the *Āraṇyaka* shows little that is remarkable, a few Rgvedic words are used with direct reference to the passages in the *Saṃhita* in which they occur. *Viśva* is found only in the phrase *viśve devāḥ* and twice in etymologies, I 2, 2, II, 2 1. *Īkṣa tu katha ca* occurs twice, III, 1, 3, 4. Other interesting words are *ajataḥ* III, 1, 2, from *√jat*, to stretch, *ādam*, III, 1, 2, *addha-taman*, I, 2, 3, *vidale*, III, 1, 2, *batarakani*, III 2, 4, *mañjīstha*, III, 2, 4, *sambalhatamah* from *√bambh*, I, 4, 1, *bisani*, III 2, 4, and *brśih*, I, 2, 4, where the dental *s* is remarkable, *datāḥ*, I, 4 1, which is taken by Sayana from *√du gatau*, *ulbanisnn*, II, 3, 8, *atājat*, II, 4, 3 which is usually derived from *√av*, meaning 'devour', *sutani*, I, 2 2, *ṛṣṭapam*, II, 1, 2, *vikṣudram* I 5 1, *vija.ah*, of doubtful number, I, 4 1, *satyām* for *satyam*, II 1, 5, *samanodarkam*, I 5, 3, *stomatīśamsanayai*, I, 4, 1, *antastyam*, I, 5, 1, *ksudramīram* II, 6, *udbhijani* II, 6, &c.

Throughout between vowels *d* and *dh* are written *f* and *lh*. This is carefully observed in the best MSS and has been followed consistently. In II, 4, 3 *saṁso* is supported by the MSS, and in III, 2 4 *majura-grī.ameghe* seems to stand for *majūnagrīva(h) ameghe*, and cf *acjostha-īarabhyam*, III, 1, 3. *Namo astu* is the form in the MSS in III, 1 3, 4, and they read in III, 1, 2 *tasmin ha svam*. Irregular lengthening of vowels appears in *īu nu*, III, 1, 2, and *ṛjyūā*, II, 3 8, in the latter case in a verse. The sandhi of *au* is peculiar, it becomes *av* before all vowels except *u* or *u*, when it becomes *u*. The same rule is usually followed in the *Āitareya* and other *Brahmanas* (Aufrecht's ed., p. 427).

In noun and adjective declension there are few irregularities. *Ātman*,

I, 5, 2, occurs besides *atmani*, II, 5, *śiṣṭan*, I, 5, 2, also is found *Aksobhyam*, II, 4, 1 (cf Rgveda, X, 163) shows irregular lengthening of the vowel *Āpah*, II, 4, 1, appears to be an accusative as not seldom elsewhere *Aikya*, III, 2, 3, is perhaps a neuter instrumental. The genitive singular of nouns and adjectives and pronouns which show *ah* in the Rgveda and in the later language have *ai* as usual in the Brāhmanas. The only exceptions appear to be *prthivyah* II 1, 7, III, 1, 2, *aiyah* and *amuyah*, III, 1, 2, 2, 5. In the ablative is found *brhatyāi* II, 3, 6, *asyai pratisthayaḥ*, I, 2, 4, of superlatives *brahmatatamam* II, 4, 3 for *brahmatatatamam*, and *annatamam prajacjante*, I, 4, 1, are remarkable. *Catuspadaḥ* and *catuspatsu* occur in I, 1, 2, with *v l catuspadaḥ*. *Navasrakṣ* in II, 3, 6, anomalously appears to stand for *navasrakṣuk*. *Enat* in II, 4, 3 is apparently a nominative as in Aitareya Brāhmaṇa VII 22, and if so *paran* is used as a neuter *Nabhyai* with the longer form occurs in II 4 1, in the ablative. *Enam* is used almost as an adjective, III, 1, 3. *Imasmas* occurs in II, 3, 7.

The numerals show certain interesting forms. *Ekayā na trimsat* occurs in I, 1, 2. Besides *sapta satam vimśatis ca*, III, 2, 1, appears *sapta vimśatisatam* III 2, 1, so also *trini santisatam* (= 360), III 2, 1, and *pañca catvarimśatsatam* (= 540), III, 2, 2 as usual in the Brāhmanas. The form *ṣaṭtrimsatam sahasram*, II, 2, 4, 3, 8, denotes 36,000, and may be considered, perhaps like *ṣaṭtrimsatam ekapadaḥ* Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 1, as an irregular use of accusative for nominative, cf *pañcavimśatim samidhenyah*, V, 1, 1.

Among verbal forms may be noted the Vedic forms, *duḥe*, I, 3, 2, and *ise*, II, 1, 2, 5, as third persons, both these forms occur in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. As in that Brāhmaṇa unaugmented forms occur in *śhata*, II, 4, 1, 3, and *padi*, II, 1, 2. *Upanisatasada* in II, 2, 3 is supported by all the MSS. *Abhivyañjyat* in II, 4, 3 appears, if the reading is correct, to be the aorist of *abhivyañjya* with the *ts* augmented. *Atrapjāt* and the irregular *agrahanyat*, II, 4, 3, are examples of the rare conditional. The perfects *dādāra*, I, 5, 2, II, 1, 7, and *bibhāja*, I, 3, 4, occur also in the Brāhmaṇa. *Dadrśe*, II, 1, 3, 8, and *mene*, III, 1, 1, are, the former certainly, the latter probably passive. The *√kr* alone is used as an auxiliary in the periphrastic perfect viz *upāsām cakṛe*, II, 1, 8, and *vedayām cakṛe*, III, 1, 1. The following desiderative forms occur *ipsati* II, 3, 2, *ipsantah*, I, 1, 1, *vacakṣet*, III, 2, 6,

ayghrksat, II, 4, 3, *atyajghamsat* II, 4, 3, *abhutvrsat*, I, 3, 1, *bibhatseta*, II, 3, 7, *munamsante*, III, 2, 3, *virurucseta*, III, 2, 5, and the rare aorist *samadhatsisam* III, 2, 5 which is a distinct sign of antiquity. The only intensives are *popluyante*, *sarsrpyante*, I, 3, 5, and probably the form *varadisat*, II, 4, 3, which I take as an aorist subjunctive, also an old form. The denominative *patayasi* occurs in I, 3, 5. For the infinitive and subjunctive forms see below. There are no irregularities in the use of **iva* and **ya* such irregularities being characteristic especially in the case of **ya* of epic style, not of the Vedic style. The gerund in *am* appears in *pranavam* and *chandaskaram*, I, 5, 1. It may be noted that in II, 1, 4, *smah* is substituted for *smasi* of the quotation. *Attam*, II, 3, 6, and *apikta*, III, 2, 5 may also be mentioned.

Very characteristic of the early date of the Aranyaka is the separation of prefixes and their verbs. It is not normal, the great majority of prefixes are placed immediately before the verb, and I have accordingly printed them as forming compounds. But the older tradition survives in the following cases: *ati manyeta*, II, 3, 3, *anu yujate*, II, 3, 8 (in a verse), *abhi samvakanti*, *ibid*, *a gachati*, *gachatah gachanti*, I, 1, 4, *a jayate*, II, 3, 1, *abhi irnatti*, I, 3, 1, *para bhavati*, II, 1, 4, &c, *adhi caranti*, *bhavati jayate*, II, 3, 1.

Pluti and the consequent lengthening of the vowels concerned occurs sporadically. The MSS differ considerably, like the editions in noting the Pluti, and it has as a rule been considered proper to insert it in the text only where Sāyana mentions its presence.

In regard to syntax it may be noted that the rules of concord are usually carefully followed as in all old works. In II, 1, 7, examples will be found of a masculine and a feminine singular, and a masculine and a neuter singular, being accompanied by a verb in the dual, and a plural masculine accompanies a feminine plural and a masculine singular. *Andam* in III, 1, 2, is unusual, as *andah* would be expected, but cf *sarvam atati*, I, 5, 2, *samanam atitayah*, II, 1, 2. In III, 2, 4, *etesam kimcid* occurs, although *svapnam* is to be understood. The usual attraction to the number and gender of the predicate occurs in I, 4, 1 *athato vyavas ta virajo bhavanti*, II, 6, 1, &c. The plural in *adyuh*, II, 1, 2, and *dadyuh*, II, 1, 5, offers difficulties.

In the use of the pronouns there is little of note. The forms of the base *enad* occur frequently, but as in all the Brahmanas the pronouns

are used in a very confusing and inaccurate way. Double pronouns are very common e.g. *sa eṣaḥ*, II, 1, 5, 8, 3, 3, 6, 4, 3, III, 1, 1, 2, 4, &c., *saiṣa*, II, 3, 6, 4, 3, III, 1, 6, *tad etad* II, 1, 2, 3, 6, 4, 3, *taṣyatasya*, (neut.) II, 2, 4, III, 2, 1, (masc.) III, 2, 1, 3, *tasya etasya* (gen.) III, 2, 6, *ta etah*, II, 1, 4, 2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 2, *etad tad*, II, 1, 8, *taṁ imam*, I, 1, 2, *tad idam*, II, 1, 2, *ta imah*, II, 1, 1, *taṁ imam*, II, 1, 1, *so 'yam*, II, 5, 1, *soyam*, II, 1, 2, *tasya me*, II, 2, 3, *ja eṣaḥ* II, 2, 1, *jo 'yam* III, 2, 3 &c. *Ya* forms numerous indefinite combinations which are given in the Index, *s v*. The usual correlations are *ja* and *sa*, e.g. *je te*, II, 1, 1, &c., *jad tad*, II, 3, 6, &c. More unusual are *tad etad jad etad*, II, 1, 2, *jad etad-tad etad*, II, 5, 1, *etad jad etad*, II, 3, 6, *jad etad tad* II, 3, 7. In one case it is uncertain whether a relative *m* not omitted, viz. II, 5 *ko 'yam atumeti vajam upasmanāḥ*, where *jam* may be read.

In case construction there is the usual freedom. The accusative denotes duration of time in *śatam varṣaṁ*, II, 2, 1, *samvatsaram ga rakṣayate*, III, 1, 6, where the use of the historic present *m* to be noted, *ahoratre varṣati*, III, 1, 2, where the meaning *m* 'day and night continuously'. The cognate accusative appears in *aśyam ayan*, II, 1, 1, and *kakakulayagandhikam vjayati* III, 2, 4. Other uses are *sartam madhyato dadhe*, II, 2, 1, *enau atikṣaranti* II, 2, 2, *jyotiḥ prakāśam karoti*, II, 1, 8, *akāśaṁ samet* III, 2, 4. More unusual is the use of the accusative as if in apposition to the main sentence as in *irjātam cābhyuṭthanam ca*, I, 5, 1. The instrumental is used with *√stu* *mahāvratena stutā*, III, 2, 4. The dative is used with *√arc* *sarvebhyo bhutebhyo 'rcata*, II, 2, 2, and *sarvebhyo rdhebhya 'rcata*, *ibid* which *m* probably an extension of the usual *datus commodi* found in the same passage with *kṣarati*. The date of 'work contemplated' appears in *punjabhyah karmabhyah pratidhuyate*, II, 5. Other datives used predicatively are practically equivalent to infinitives, see below. In *sarvebhyo bhutebhyo dadṛśe*, II, 1, 3, 8, the case may be dative or ablative. The ablative follows *anyat* in *anyat kuśalāḥ brahmanam brujāt* III, 1, 3 (cf. I, 1, 2) when the double accusative is interesting. In III, 2, 4, *atmana et iśya tat kṛtam bhāṣati* *atmana* may stand for *atmanah*, a predicative genitive, or for *atmane*, *m datus commodi*, the former view is supported by V, 3, 3, *atmano kṛtasya tac chāstam bhāṣati*. In either case *iśya* is to be taken probably directly with *kṛtam* and *śastam*, cf. *nak proktam*, III, 2, 1, *asya uditam*, II, 1, 5. Worthwhile of note is the construction in

Āranyaka I, 6, there occur—as usually in the rest of the Āranyaka—perfects, *upajagāma* (cf *upajaya*) *urāca*, and *uce*. There must be a common source for the two narratives despite the difference of their present forms, and it must have used perfects in narrative. Besides these narrative perfects, perfects in the present sense occur in *dadhara*, II 1, 7, *dadrse* II, 1, 3, 8, both of which are conjoined with present tenses.

In Aranyaka II, 4-6, occur sixty-one examples of the imperfect from twenty-three forms of nineteen roots (*asit*, *arjata*, *iksata* (5), *amurchayat*, *atapāt* (2), *abhidya* (5), *abhadjetām* (3) *apatam*, *arjat*, *abravīt* (2), *abrutam*, *abruvan* (4), *anajat* (3), *aviśat* (5), *avisan* (3), *ajujata* (2), *ajighāmsat*, *ajighiksat* (8), *aśaknot* (7), *avayat*, *apadyata*, *apaśyat*, *abhavat* (2). The only narrative perfect is *urāca*, II, 5, and there is one present perfect, *dadhe*, II, 2, 1.

In Aranyaka III occur *asramsata* and *adadhat* (2), III, 1, 6, and the present perfects, *mene*, III, 1, 1, *viduh*, III, 2, 5.

The two periphrastic perfects *upasam cakrīre*, II, 1, 8, and *vedajam cakre*, III, 1, 1, may both be narrative perfects, but the latter may be a present perfect.

The results may be tabulated as follows, omitting periphrastic forms, the Ślokas in II, 3, 8, are not taken into account. The numbers in brackets denote the number of roots.

Āranyaka	Imperfects.	Present Perfects	Narrative Perfects
I,	7 (5)	3 (3)	3 (2, <i>asa</i> and <i>urajaca</i> (1))
II, 1, 2, 1-2, 3	67 (19)	2 (2)	3 (1, <i>babhuvā</i>)
II, 2, 3-4	None	None	17 (6)
II, 4-6	61 (19)	1 (1)	None

The fair conclusion is that the Aranyaka is older than the later books, VI-VIII, of the Aitareya Brahmana as is indeed probable in view of the much more developed narrative style of the Sunahśepa legend. It is probably older than parts (if not the whole) of the Satapatha Brahmana, viz I-V, X, XII-XIV, including the Brhadaranyaka Upanisad, which uses the narrative perfect throughout. In view of the copious and rich style of that Upanisad with its wealth of metaphor, ease of motion, and dignity, it seems impossible to doubt that it belongs to a much later period than the Aitareya just as we have seen that its philosophic content goes far beyond that of the Aitareya. Bearing in mind that the Brhadāranyaka shows considerable evidence of the activity of the Ksatryas, and that

the perfect as a narrative tense is common in the Epic, it may be suggested that the origin of the narrative use in the Brahmanas is to be found in a borrowing from the style of the old Itihāsa literature. It is perhaps not without significance that such legends as that of Śunahśepa, Pururavas and Urvāśi (Śatapatha Brahmana, XI, 5, 1) Cyavana (ibid., IV, 1, 5), and, in the Antareya Aranyaka itself, that of Viśvāmitra, II, 2, 3, should be told in perfects. It may be noted that in the Śāṅkhya Śrauta Sūtra XV, 17 sq., the Śunahśepa legend is also set out in perfects. The Brahmana use of the perfect is as a present, while both usages are found in the earlier language of the Rgveda Samhitā. The older is undoubtedly the Brahmana use as it corresponds most closely with the use of the Greek perfect as a completed action or state (cf. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*², p. 31).

The future indicative is used in its ordinary way as denoting future time in assertions or questions, but the so-called second future never occurs, as it does, e.g. in the Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa.

The optative is of comparatively very frequent occurrence. (1) Its use as denoting wish is infrequent, the subjunctive usually being preferred, but (2) its use in directions as a mild imperative occurs passim. (3) It is also used in questions to express doubt precisely as is used the subjunctive with which it alternates in II, 4, 3 *katham nu vidam mad rite syat katarena prapadyai*. (4) Its most characteristic use in the Āranyaka is in the protasis and apodosis of conditional sentences. In the apodosis it may denote either direction or the potential. In all cases the condition is one referring to the future, and is of the type 'If A happens then B will happen, or should be done.' Examples of two potentials are *jadā atnuvina manyeta*, II, 3, 3, so III, 1, 6, (with *jad*=if) II, 3, 6, III, 2, 2, (with *jatha*) III, 1, 3, 4. Examples of a potential protasis and imperative apodosis are (with *jad*) I, 1, 1, III, 1, 3, 6, 2, 4, 6, (with relatives) I, 2, 2, III, 2, 4, 5, and without any particle *pasyet-dr̥ḥyajatam-vidjās*, III, 2, 4, with double protasis, *upaśruṇyat jadā śruṇyat vidjāt*, III, 2, 4. (5) Arising from this potential use the optative appears as an indefinite, like the Greek subjunctive and optative or the Latin subjunctive. This is possibly the explanation of the difficult phrases in II, 1, 2 *na tasyete jan nādyaḥ jad vanaṃ nādjuh*, II, 1, 5 *na tasyete jan mahyam na dadjuh* though the meaning might be merely a future. Definitely indefinite is III, 2, 1 *jatha śalā amse sarie nja amśah*.

samāhitāḥ syuh, since the apodosis is an assertion of fact (6) An optative of characteristic, that is of result is found in III, 2, 3, *brahmanam kurvita so paśyet*. It will be seen that none of these usages offer any difficulty of explanation on the now generally accepted theory¹ that the optative is originally a weak future in sense.

As in other languages the indicative can be used modally, and in conditional sentences this use is well developed in the Āranyaka. In II, 3, 3, *jady antarikṣalokaṁ āsmute 'ty enam manyate* is clearly modal, and is followed by *jady āsmurita manjeta*. So *jatra vishyete vidyat* in III, 2, 4. Hence indicatives are sometimes combined with optatives in protases of conditional sentences, the following occur in III, 2, 4, *jatra drīyate paśyet na paśyet paśyeta vidyat*, *jatra drīyate abhikhyajeta paśyet, vidyat*, *upakṣeta tuḥ jathā drīyante-jada na paśyet, vidyat*, III, 1, 4, *ja upavadet cen manjeta aha brīyat*. The indicative also occurs in conditions where the fact is asserted in the apodosis (with *jady*), e.g. II, 4, 3, or when the protasis and apodosis refer to the future, e.g. *jasmim patyati-bhaviṣyati*, II, 1, 4.

The only case of a condition in the past which was not fulfilled occurs in II, 4, 3 *jad hamad vacagrahakṣjad abhivṛjāhṛtya karāṇnam atrapsyat*, &c. where the conditional is correctly employed. This accuracy in the use of the conditional and generally in the use of the optative is characteristic of an early date.

The subjunctive is of comparatively frequent occurrence, usually in the first person. It denotes (a) resolve *pratiśama utkramama* II, 1, 4, *syjat*, II, 4, 1, 3, *adama* (in a relative clause), II, 4, 2, (b) desire *asmi*, I, 5, 2, II, 1, 4, 2, 2 *asat*, I, 4, 3, 5, 1, *apūnāsi* I, 4, 3, 5, 2, *avarunadhāt*, I, 4, 3, *asnavat*, I, 4, 3 (c) doubt in questions *bravasi*, III, 2, 6, *prapadyasi* II, 4, 3, *varadisi* II, 4, 3 if this is so taken, (d) with *ne* *ucchidyat* I, 2, 4, *asat*, I, 5, 2.

The imperative occurs several times, but there is no instance of the use of *ma* except in II, 7, 1, which is not genuine, where *ma prahasth* (or *prahasit*) is found. The Śāṅkhayana Aranyaka, XI, 6, has *mā* with the future.

The infinitive in *tum* occurs only twice in both cases with the verb

¹ Cf Goodwin *Greek Moods and Tenses* App. A. This would account for the disappearance of one of the tenses in Latin

Tentonic, and Balto-Slavic (Lindsay, *Latin Language* pp. 511-516).

śak, *samdhātum nasakāśi*, III, 1, 4, *asaknot grahītum*, II, 4, 3. This is consistent with the early date of the Aranyaka. On the other hand, as in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa *īkṣara* is construed with the infinitive in *ītoḥ, bhavitoḥ*, II, 3, 5, 6, *caritoḥ*, I, 1, 1, *prastoh*, II, 3, 5. Mention should also be made of a series of datives formed from verbal roots by the affix *īyas* which serve as predicative datives signifying that to which an active tends viz *kīpīyas*, I, 3, 8, *abhyapīyas*, I, 1, 2, *prajapīyas*, I, 2, 4, 3, 1, 4, 4, 1, *santapīyas*, II, 5, *apīyas*, I, 1, 3, 2, 1, 3, 3, 8, *adhyapīyas*, I, 4, 2, *upapīyas*, I, 3, 7, *acaruddhīyas*, I, 1, 2, &c, *apahapīyas* (probably), I, 2, 2. The use of these forms is not precisely that of infinitives but it is analogous and forms a distinct feature of the style of the Aranyaka. Similar forms occur in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.

The injunctive, except in the form of the second person plural imperative occurs only in *arjayan*, I, 5, 2.

In the use of participles the most characteristic feature is their use in place of finite verbs, a use arising from their employment as predicative adjectives. In the following cases the substantive verb is expressed *uktam bhavati*, I, 3, 8, II, 1, 5, 8, III, 2, 4, *uditam bhavati*, II, 1, 5, *visto 'sini*, II, 2, 3, *vyaptam bhavati*, III, 1, 3, *samahitah syuh*, III, 2, 1, *kṛtam bhavati*, III, 2, 4, *apīṣṭa bhavati*, III, 2, 5, *anusaktā gāt*, I, 5, 2. In all these cases the expression means more than the corresponding form of the finite verb would have conveyed, and denotes a completed action whose results persist in the present. The accurate use of these forms is a distinct sign of early style. The same remark applies to most of the cases of the use without the copula *sikṣitam*, I, 1, 1, *pratīṣṭhitam*, I, 1, 2, *pratīṣṭhitah*, I, 2, 2, 4, 2, *pratīṣṭhita*, I, 3, 4, *vīṣṭak*, *vīṣṭah*, I, 3, 8, *avīṣṭak*, *avīṣṭah*, II, 1, 1, *īṣṭak*, I, 5, 3, II, 1, 4, *channah*, II, 1, 6, *srīṣṭau srīṣṭak*, II, 1, 7, *āṣṭam*, II, 3, 6, *a-ṣṭam*, II, 1, 6, *vīṣṭabdhak*, *vīṣṭabdhakam*, II, 1, 6, *sītam*, II, 1, 6, *uvīṣṭak*, II, 3, 3, *samahitah*, III, 2, 1, *īṣṭak*, III, 2, 4, *samparetak*, III, 2, 4, in these instances the effect persists into the present, and no examples of a use like *drīṣṭa* = 'she was seen' occur. In II, 4, 3 *yadī vacobhīṣṭī dhṛtam*, &c, the sense approximates very closely to a mere present passive indicative.

There is no instance of the participle in *īat* formed from the past participle passive, which is so common later. That participle occurs also combined with the participle of *√as* *dutak satyāḥ*, I, 4, 1, *sikṣitam sat*, I, 4, 2.

In one case the present participle is combined with the \sqrt{as} *tapann asmi*, II, 2, 3 expressing ■ continuing present. It is used with \sqrt{man} in *laknuvan manyeta alaknuvantam manyeta*, III, 1, 4, where the change of case ■ remarkable. Note also *anudgrhuan sandadhad varsati*, III, 1, 2.

The gerund appears equivalent to a present participle in *himkrtya pratipadyate*, I 3, 1, where the action of the verb and participle are simultaneous (cf my note on the gerund, *J R A S*, 1907, p 164).

The gerundive *karanryam* is used with \sqrt{man} in III, 2, 4. Here may be noted the strange form *abhyvajarjan*, III, 1, 6, which has the sense of a future participle and the form of a participle of the *s* aorist. No correction seems probable as **haryan* (cf Whitney, *Translation of Atharvaveda*, p 846) is impossible.

The use of conjunctive particles ■ marked by the number ■ combinations allowed as contrasted with the comparatively barren character of the later language. In most of them *ha* plays some part. Examples are *ha vai*, I, 2, 1, &c, II, 1, 2 &c, III, 1, 2, &c, *na ha vai*, I, 2, 1, 5, 2, III, 2, 2, *u haiva*, I 3, 8, II, 2, 4, *evam u haiva*, I, 3, 4, 8, *atha ha vai*, I, 4, 2, *haiva* I 5, 2, II, 1, 4, 8, 3, 7, 4, 3, *u ha sma*, I, 1, 1, &c, *evam u ha sma*, III, 1, 2, *ha sma vai*, I, 1, 3, II, 1, 5, 8, 2, 4, III, 2, 5, 6, *ha sma*, II, 3, 5, 7, III 1, 3, 2, 1, *ha tu*, II, 3, 5, *atha ha*, III, 1, 1, 5, *u ha u*, I, 3, 3, *athapi*, III, 2, 4, *atha khalu*, III, 1, 5, 2, 5, *athatah* I, 4, 1, &c, *atho*, I, 1, 2, &c, *u khalu*, III, 1, 6, *u eva*, II, 1, 1, 2, 1, III, 1, 3, *tu eva* I, 1, 1, 5, 2, II, 1, 4, *tasmad hapy etarku*, II, 1, 8, *napu*, III, 1, 2, *akharva* (?), II, 1, 2.

Of single conjunctions the use of *ca* is most important. The regular use ■ *ca ca*, a formalism distinctly indicative of age, see I, 1, 4, 2, 3, 3, 1, 4, 4, 5, 7, 5, 1, II 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 2, 2, 6, 1, III, 1, 1, 6, 2, 3, and in I, 1, 2, *chandah* is in apposition to *brhatim ca vrajam ca*. A single *ca* is practically restricted to numerals, ■ *g vimlati ca* II, 3, 6. In I, 2, 2, is found *ca ca ca*, and in II, 6, III, 1, 6 *ca ca ca ca*. In the *Ślokas* in II, 3, 3, appears *gad gar ca gar so gad u ca*. These facts render the usual division of *vajamsi sangavagadhaś cerapadah*, II, 1, 1, into *ca irapadah* excessively improbable. *Iva* ■ used frequently (see reff in Index V) in a sense hardly differing from *eva*, as ■ also the case in the *Āitareya Brahmana* though it can always be translated 'as it were', merely modifying the literal sense of the verb, cf I, 1, 2.

cirāṭaram ita ita agachanti *Va* has the sense 'indeed' as well as that of 'or', but a single *it* is more common than a double *it*, unlike the case of *ca*. *Ita* is used with the subjunctive, II 1, 4, as in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*. *Iti* has as usual a large variety of uses, and is never misplaced. *Cana* in III, 1, 3, 4, following *na* appears to have the force of 'even'. *Kama*, I, 1, 1, III, 2, 4, *ata* II, 2, 2, 4, 2, and *vata*, I, 3, 4, &c., also occur. *Aha* is contrasted with *u* in II, 3, 7.

The same relative wealth is seen in the case of correlative particles. The most common form is *yad tad*, denoting time or cause, or comparison, I 1, 1, 3, 1, II 1, 4, 2, 2, 5, 1, III, 1, 3, variants are *yat tena*, III 2, 6, *yat tasmāt*, II, 1, 6, 2, 1, 2, 3, 6, III 2, 6, more definitely signifying cause. So *yad hi tasmāt*, II, 1, 3. A characteristic and frequent type of sentence is I, 1, 3, *tad yau madhuchandasam samasati sarasam kumānam avaruddhaya*, cf I 2, 2, &c. *Yatha* is usually balanced by *evam*, II, 1, 6, 3, 5, III, 1, 2, 2, 1, 5, it stands alone in *yathāndam*, II, 4, 1, *yatha nam angam*, II, 5, 1. It is balanced by *tathā* in *yathā prithivī tathā* &c., in II, 1, 2. In I, 3, 1, is *yatha vai evam*. *Yatra* either has no correlative, as in III, 2, 4, or is balanced by *tad*, II, 1, 8, *tad utapti*, III, 1, 2, *tadā*, III, 1, 6. *Yada* is balanced by *attha*, II, 5, *yad hi* by *hauva* II, 1, 5, *yad ha* by *hauva*, II 4, 3. In III, 1, 3, 4, occurs the phrase *yathā hi katha ca bruyād abhyāsam ita yat tathā yāt*, where the words *abhyāsam eva yat tathā* practically form a compound adverb.

Finally it may be mentioned that the grammatical terms *yojan* and *evjan* are used for feminine and masculine, I, 2, 4, 8 in *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, VI, 2.

A comparison of the forms and usages cited above with the valuable list of similar forms in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* given by Aufrecht¹ shows conclusively that the *Aranyaka* stands on nearly the same footing as the first five books of the *Brāhmaṇa*. It is not so old, e.g. it has fewer forms of the subjunctive, no infinitives in *-e* or *-ak* or *-tasat*, and none in *tok* after *d* or *pura*, but it is not much younger. The use of the narrative tenses is some argument for its being older than Books VI–VIII, to which otherwise it stands close in point of language, though it is much less developed in style.

¹ *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, pp. 427–431

The conclusion arrived at above on grounds of doctrine that the Śāṅkhāyana Aranyaka I, II, is later than the Aitareya Āranyaka I-III, is confirmed by the linguistic tests. Generally the two works correspond most closely in vocabulary, and confirm the view that they must be derived ultimately from a common source. For example, Dr Friedlander well explains *atikaran* in Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, I, 7, as 'laying across', as it means in Aitareya Aranyaka, V, 1, 4, and not, as explained by the commentator on the Śrauta Sūtra, in the sense 'withdrawing'. Probably the common source of the two Aranyakas had the word which has survived only in the Sūtra part of the Aitareya, but in both the Sūtra and Āranyaka of the Śāṅkhāyanas. With the forms quoted above may be compared the irregular sandhi *niṣ tad*, I, 8, the noun and adjective forms, *ātman*, I, 8, II, 1, *etasyaḥ devatayaḥ* (gen.), I, 8, *adhitarāṃ*, I, 7; *udjatatarah*, I, 7, the datives of end served, *bhogyaya*, I, 8, *santyaḥ*, I, 4, *bhūṣajjayaḥ*, I, 4, *avāptyaḥ*, *āptyaḥ*, I, 2, II, 6, the constructions *īśvarah naparajetoḥ*, I, 8, *gamṣyanti bhavati*, I, 8, *upāptā asan*, I, 6; *śamsyate*, I, 5 (cf *śamsyantam*, Aitareya, II, 2, 3), *yathā parivyayedhatte*, II, 16, 1 ad fin, the use of the particles *n vai*, I, 1, 3, *na ha vai*, I, 8, *ha vai*, I, 5, 7, *tathā ha*, II, 1, 11 *ha*, I, 6, II, 10, the construction of the sentence with *tad yad*, II, 10, the irregular numeral *sapta vimśatisatam*, II, 10. As has been seen above the narrative perfect occurs in II, 6, the parallel passage to Aitareya, II, 2, 3, and it occurs also in II, 17 (*provaca*, *jijṛā*), which may be compared with II, 2, 4, as far as the *provaca* is concerned. Whereas however, the perfects in the Aitareya are marked exceptions, there is no other narrative tense in Śāṅkhāyana. Further, the language of the Śāṅkhāyana Aranyaka is much more accurate and modern than that of the Aitareya. Instead of *ṣaṭtrimśatam sahasraṃ* the correct *sattrimśat* is found, II, 17, there are no subjunctives other than those of the first person, which occur with *ned*, I, 1, as in the Aitareya, there are no irregular forms either of nouns pronouns or verbs, save those mentioned above, the aorist is only represented by *avocant* in I, 6. *Ca* is used in *śastrena ca vratacaraya*, I, 6, in a way not paralleled in the Aitareya and in that chapter occurs the form *viṣṇūsaṃ eva cakre*, a periphrastic perfect of the desiderative, a form elsewhere practically confined to the Śatapatha Brahmana. After making full allowance for the difference of length, the posteriority of the Śāṅkhāyana is almost certain. If, as seems probable,

*brahma*¹ and *brahman* in I, 5, 6, refer to Brahman and his wife, who perhaps owes her origin to these passages, then a strong argument is added for the later date of the Sāṅkhayana since the Aitareya does not even certainly know Brahman since the passages in which *brahmā* certainly appears refer to the Brahman priest, and in all the others *brahma* may equally well be read Brahman, however, appears in Aitareya Brahmana, V, 33 : Books VII–XIII of the Sāṅkhayana are still later

Āraṇyaka V is written in the regular Sūtra style. It is practically impossible to understand it without a commentary for as usual the rules are condensed into unintelligibility. Characteristic is the weight thrown on single words and phrases, e.g. *ajapaya vṛta*, V, 1, 4, *aridhakaraṇa*, V, 1, 1, and the frequent use of gerunds, besides the piling up of adjectives and adverbial phrases

In Sandhi it appears that *au* before *u* becomes *a*, although here, as in Āraṇyaka I–III, the MSS and the Anandaśrama edition vary. Unusual forms are *atman*, V, 1, 6, *uttare* (loc), V, 1, 2, *vadatyah* without *u*, V, 1, 1, *ardhargāh*, V, 2, 5, meaning 'to be recited by half verses', *brhatikaram*, V, 1, 6, *gāyatrikaram* V, 3, 1, *triyazarjam*, V, 1, 6, *sa mutah*, V, 1, 3. Of desideratives occur *jijivīset*, V, 3, 1, *jigamīset*, V, 1, 4, and as amended, a desiderative causal *cakīrtayīset* V, 3, 3. The imperative *prabruṣat* occurs in a direction, in V, 1, 5. The feminine genitive form is *āh*, not *ai*.

More characteristic is the pregnant use of case constructions, when for the sake of brevity everything is made to depend on the mere case relation, e.g. (accusative) *azabrīham preṇkham harejuh*, II, 3, 2, *apra-kampī*, V, 1, 3, in quasi apposition to the sentence, (dative) *nijhetatyaya stuvate*, V, 1, 5, *azahakarmāne jigamīset*, V, 1, 4, (abl) *hotrās caturvīṃśat*, V, 1, 1, (gen) *mahāsvatasya pañcavīṃśatim samudhēyah*, V, 1, 1, where the irregular *pañcavīṃśatim* is also noteworthy, (abl and gen) *caturvīṃśān maruṭaśyājanak*, V, 1, 1, (loc) *dīkṣite rajamānāśabdah*, V, 1, 5, *na iatse ca na trīṣe* ('in the case of') V, 3, 3, (loc. and instr) *arjasyu cet samamnatāsu rajanena samna stuvīran*, V, 1, 6, cf *bhujasyu cet stuvīran* V, 3, 2, other uses are the dative after *dhatte* with *sam*, *sam pakṣayoh patanaya*, V, 1, 6, an apposition of whole and part *śakhyā mūladesena*, V, 1, 4, and *abuddham-arya*, V, 3, 2. Very strange is

¹ The form *brāhman* is curious and 'and his wife'. Cf Jaiminīya Upaniṣad the passage may mean 'the Brahman Brāhmana III, 4, 9

śrīyam gor atvam atman dhatte, V, 1, 6, where *gor* may be a possessive genitive or a genitive of description

In the verb occur two subjunctives in directions put in the mouth of the sacrificer, *pariṇayatha*, V, 1, 1, *unayatha*, V, 1, 2. In V, 3, 2, purpose is expressed by *yatha na* with *hanisyasi*, a curious but not rare (e.g. in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa) use. The optative occurs in directions frequently, and in both protasis and apodosis of conditions, (a) with potential force in both, e.g. *yātar-azaperan tāvanti jyīṣet*, V, 3, 1, (b) with imperative force in the apodosis (with *yatra tatra*, and *yatra tu kāmam-tatra*) V, 3, 3, (with *yadi*), V, 1, 4, 3, 3, (with *ced*), V, 1, 6, (with a relative), V, 1, 5. In V, 1, 4, *yada śrāṇyet* is probably indefinite, in V, 3, 3, *yady api adhyat na snatako bhavati*, the indicative in the apodosis probably expresses the certainty of the result, in V, 3, 2 the apodosis to *cyaveta ced* is curtailed, so also in V, 2, 1.

With regard to participles *jagarito bhavati*, V, 1, 1, and *upakṛpto bhavati*, V, 1, 3, both denote a past action resulting in a present state. *Upalambhamyah*, V, 1, 1, is a sign of comparatively late date, the earlier form being *upalambhyah*, cf. Śāṅkhāyana Aranyaka, I, 1. No infinitives occur, but many gerunds, e.g. V, 3, 3, and in all about 36 instances are found. In place of an infinitive there is in V, 3, 2, *ijyaya sampresitah*. The past participle passive in *yathetam*, V, 1, 2, 3, is simply the equivalent of a past indicative.

The use of particles is comparatively restricted. There occur the following combinations: *atha ha*, V, 2, 4, *ihava, sho eva*, V, 1, 6, *ha sma*, V, 3, 3, *haiva*, V, 3, 3, *no eva*, V, 3, 3, *iva* is equal to *eva* in V, 3, 2, *aha* occurs in V, 1, 6, *khalu* in V, 1, 6, *kānam* in V, 3, 3, *punar api* in V, 1, 4. In the case of *ca* the single use is the more common, as compared with Āranyaka I-III, in *na vatte ca na trīye*, V, 3, 3 the *ca* may connect with the previous sentence, or be like *śāstreṇa ca brahmacaryaya* in Śāṅkhāyana Aranyaka I, 6. In V, 1, 1, *etaś carvasvakakarar (mantrair) eky madhu ite ca* occurs. In V, 3, 3, *is na cana*.

Among other signs of late date may be reckoned the frequency of the locative absolute, the use of adverbial expressions like *antarvedi*, V, 1, 1, *anuparikramanam*, V, 1, 4, *viharanaprabhṛti*, V, 1, 1, *anuvrcam*, V, 1, 1, the plural of authorship as found in *nīdarsanajodaharisyamah*, V, 3, 3, and the use of gerunds like *napitena karayitva*, V, 3, 3.

The same style and diction are found in Āśvalayana's Śrauta Sūtra, which, like Āraṇyaka V, consists of a disconnected string of sentences, which, when consisting of more than a few words, are constructed by heaping adjectives on adjectives, adding adverbial phrases, using gerunds, and piling up cases in different senses. There is no independent evidence to show that there is any great difference in time between the Āraṇyaka V and the Śrauta Sūtra.

There seems no reason to suppose that the Āraṇyaka V is not more ancient than the Sankhāyana Śrauta Sūtra XVII, XVIII. Hillebrandt has, indeed, suggested that the Sankhāyana Śrauta Sūtra is older than Āśvalayana, and although the last two Adhyāyas may be of different date from the first sixteen, still they are hardly likely to be later, so that, if Hillebrandt's conclusions are sound, the Sūtra XVII, XVIII, will be older than the Āraṇyaka V. But Hillebrandt's reasons are not convincing.¹ He points out that as Weber has said, parts of the Sūtra are written in the Brāhmaṇa style. This refers mainly to Adhyāyas XV, XVI, which contain *inter alia* the Śunahśepa legend. But even assuming that these books are part of the original Sūtra, it cannot be denied that the version of the legend is in no way original, it is merely the same as that in the Āitareya Brāhmaṇa, and differs so little from it that both versions must be descended from a common source. The part of the Āitareya where it occurs is decidedly later than the first five books. The Brāhmaṇa like style is therefore not to be attributed to Suyājña, the author of the Sūtra. Secondly, he refers to the description of the Āśvamedha and of the Puruṣamedha as signs of early age. But this argument depends greatly for its force on acceptance of the theory that Rgveda, X, 18, 8, can be explained from Śrauta Sūtra, XVI, 15 and this view is not now usually accepted.² Thirdly, he points out that the Sūtra is not written with the full brevity of the latest Sūtra style. This is true, but the argument is really in favour of the priority of Āraṇyaka V. For that work is written in a style less condensed than that of Suyājña, and certainly less condensed than that of Books XVII, XVIII. Further, it must be admitted that as a Sūtra these books are much superior to the Āraṇyaka V. The ritual directions are far more

¹ Cf. my note, *J R A S.*, 1907, pp. 410-413.

² Cf. Whitney, *Translation of Athar-*

veda, p. 848. Oldenberg, *Gott Gel Anz.*, 1907 p. 228, n. 1, see however, Lanman *Sanskrit Reader*, p. 385.

precise and detailed, contrasting with the brevity of the directions in the Aranyaka, which mainly concerns itself with a description of the litanies. In the Sūtra the whole process is gone through methodically while the Āranyaka covers only a part of the field. The style in of the usual Sūtra type, it is not in any marked manner more recent than that of the Āranyaka, but it contains practically no irregular forms. With the forms quoted above from the Aranyaka the following facts may be compared. The Sandhi of *a+r* is *ar*, XVII, 5, 9, 7, 8, of *du+u* is *a*, XVII, 10, 5, 16, 5, while *tasyah* occurs in XVII, 3, 2, as always in Aitareya Aranyaka V, *tasyai* is found XVIII, 2, 4, 19, and *prathamāya*, *dvitīyāya*, *uttamayai*, XVIII, 20. In XVII, 3, 12, 15, occur *ghatarik* and *ghatakarikah*, nominatives with the *s* preserved. The locative is used with *√stu* in XVIII, 2, 2, 22, 7, and extended to *√kr* in *atichandaksu kuryuh*, XVIII, 22, 9. Adverbial phrases besides *antarvedi* are *prasalavi*, XVII, 14, 16, 15, 4, *antahsadaḥ*, XVII, 4, 3, *nana badhinanti*, XVII, 3, 8, while *jaghanena* is used with the accusative, XVII, 5, 8.

Of verbal forms may be noted *pratyagrūtat*, XVII, 14, 3, *prabrutat*, XVII, 14, 4; *vinimsamanah*, I, 7, 3, *paryesyanto bhavanti*, XVII, 4, 8, *bhoksyamana(h) bhavanti*, *dhaksyanto (bhavanti)*, XVIII, 24, 14, 15, the gerundives *prayanīyah*, *udayanīyah*, XVIII, 24, 2, *karyam*, XVII, 6, 2, *deyam*, XVIII, 24, 32, the gerunds in *am*, *punarūdayam*, XVIII, 4, 3, 4, 5, 3, 4, *kakupkaram*, XVIII, 4, 3, 4, 5, 3, 4, *panktisamsam*, XVIII, 6, 4, 14, 4, 17, 5, *gajatrīśamsam*, XVIII, 16, 1, and the late simple form *śamsam*, XVIII, 16, 2. Of the uses of the optative that in clauses of purpose with *na* is very frequent, in XVII, 10, 8, *yadi syat mṛite*, it is purely indefinite, in *yadi na vidyeta ya etam dīyam kuryat sa etat kuryat*, XVII, 5, 4, the second optative is one of characteristic 'one who can do'. In XVIII, 24, 15, *yadi dhaksyanto (bhavanti) syat* the protasis is future in fact and the apodosis is equivalent to a mild future. In XVIII, 23, 4, *yadi jajñayajñīyam kuryas tasyoktaṁ stotriyānurūpaṁ*, the real apodosis is suppressed. Of particles may be noticed the use of *api va*, XVIII, 3, 4, and of *yady n va*, XVIII, 7, 17, 23, 5. It may be noted as a sign of more recent date that very few particles occur, *ha* only in XVII, 13, 8, *n ha* in XVIII, 2, 3, 5. In XVII, 9, 7, XVIII, 22, 10, is found the remarkable phrase *iti nṛ a u Maruśvāṭīyam, Vaituvedam*, in XVII, 1, 5, *athapi*, in XVIII, 20, 6, *atho*.

The results arrived at may be supported by a comparison with a work

of date somewhat later than the *Āranyaka V*, the *Bṛhaddevatā*, which shows a style much more modern, even despite poetic licences than the *Āranyaka I-III*, but which is still in vocabulary an archaic work, coeval in date with the early epic. An interesting list of its irregularities is given by Prof. Macdonell,¹ but they are rather of the epic type, e.g. use of *ṣa* for *ṣun* in the gerund, nominative for accusative, unaugmented pasts, &c. It is significant that (1) no genitives or ablatives for *a*, *i*, *ā*, stems in *ai* occur, (2) there are no subjunctive forms other than first person forms, (3) the infinitive in *tum* is common and no other form is found, while in *VI*, 37, even *śaptakamah* occurs. Significant also is the use of the narrative tenses. The aorist occurs only in the later narrative use and is rare, being formed only from the roots *ga*, *bhu*, *vac*, *radh*. The perfect surpasses the imperfect in frequency as a narrative tense, for in some 340 lines of narrative² there occur 202 perfects to 150 imperfects, and the proportion elsewhere is not materially different. Further, the periphrastic perfect with *asa* is frequent *kamayam asa*, *VI* 76, *utsadayam asa* *VII*, 53, *śikṣayam asa*, *III*, 84, *bodhayam asa* *VI*, 37, *tarayam asa*, *VI* 38, *chandayam asuh*, *VII*, 157, *prasadayam asa*, *VIII*, 3, *kṛtāyam asa*, *VI*, 24, *prastapayam asa* *VI*, 13, *darśayam asa*, *V*, 63, while the use of *kr* is very rare, *upamantrayam cakre* *V*, 20. Further, the past participles passive are freely used to denote action either past or present in place of finite verbs and use is made of the new participial form in *rat*, *kṛtarat* occurring in *VI* 41, *VII*, 58, *VIII*, 18, *dr̥stavan*, *V*, 58, *dr̥starat*, *VIII*, 33, *pr̥ṣṭa van*, *V*, 71, *labdharan*, *V*, 66, *hataran*, *VI*, 152 &c. Prefixes are not separated from the verbs with which they are connected. Particles are much restricted in number, and combinations are limited. Mention may also be made of the great development in grammatical doctrine seen not only in the discussion in *I* as to nouns, &c., and in *II*, 93 as to particles, but in the use of such forms as *av* locative of *an* the case termination, *ajoh* from *e*, the sign of the dual *at* the root *ad*, and so on. Indeed it is hard to resist the conclusion that the bulk of the *Āranyaka I-III* must lie before the more systematic treatment of grammatical questions in Yaska's *Nirukta*, and a new support is derived for the giving an early date to these books, since Yaska cannot well be later than 500 B.C.

¹ *Uchaddeśa* etc. I, 2222.

² See the fourth Index to Prof. Macdonell's *Bṛhaddevatā*.

It has been noted that **Book III** presupposes the Padapāṭha of the R̥gveda¹ and also the Kramapāṭha. It is therefore later than Śākalya, the author of the Padapāṭha. This, however, leaves the date undetermined, since Śākalya's date is still uncertain. Geldner² has recently argued that he dates from the later Vājasaneyya period, and not as supposed by Oldenberg from the end of the Brāhmana period, and that he was a contemporary of the Aruṇi and Yājñavalkya known from the Brāhmanas. But it is extremely hard to reconcile this with the facts that the Padapāṭha presupposes the Samhitā, that the Samhitā exhibits a text which cannot be reconciled with the statements of the Brāhmana texts³ as to the number of syllables in word groups, in consequence of the Sandhi carried out in the Samhitā. The evidence, therefore, is certainly in favour of Oldenberg's hypothesis, but it leaves the lower date of Śākalya vague. He is, however, cited by Yāska and older than Śaunaka, so that in all probability he must date not later than 600 B C. The Āranyaka III need not be much later than Śākalya, and if it is, as seems most probable, earlier than Yaska, it may be dated from about 600-550 B C. It may be added that it must be older than the Taittirīya Upaniṣad and the Sāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, VII, VIII (see note on III, 1, 2).

These chronological results are admittedly uncertain. They are based on the views that (1) the Āranyaka I-III is older than Buddhism by reason of the undeveloped character of its philosophic content, (2) that these books are older than the Brhaddevatā and Śaunaka, who may be dated about 450-400 B C, and probably older than Yaska, who can hardly be brought down lower than 550-500 B C, (3) that they are older than the developed systems of philosophy whose beginnings are at any rate known to Apastamba, whom Buhler dates in the fourth or fifth centuries B C, and who cannot well, on any view, be later than 300 B C, and that they are older than the Atharvaśiras Upaniṣad, known, it seems, to Gautama, who is older than Apastamba by some generations, (4) that they are older than Pāṇini, Katyayana, and Patañjali, who cannot well be dated later than 300, 200, and 100 B C respectively, (5) that

¹ Oldenberg, *Prolegomena*, p 380

this view, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, lxx, n 7

² *Vedische Studien* III, 144-146. See Schiefelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des R̥gveda*, pp 4, 5, who also supports

³ Cf Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp 49, 50, and note on III, 1, 2

Books I and II date from the later Brahmana¹ period but are probably older than the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, parts of the Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa and Upanisad, the Gopatha Brahmana, and the Chandogya Upanisad, and so belong to a comparatively early date.

The verses and sentences quoted contain, despite their brevity, a remarkable set of old forms. The Slokas in II, 3, 8, and the prose directions in Āraṇyaka V, are more properly treated as above as part of the main work, with which the latter no doubt coincide in time, while the former are not very much older. Of these forms may be mentioned *tanum*, *taniam* (loc.) but *tanvaḥ* (gen.) in I, 3, 5, *sarvasyaḥ* (gen.) in the verse in III, 2, 5, which is a sign of more recent origin, the compounds *Vāruṇatayutānam*, *prthivyupardm*, *brahmandbhartrkam*, *īarṣṣparitram*, V, 3, 2, the forms *arajah* (?), *tujah*, *ats vjāluk*, *rāntyam*, *vduam* (?), *ddhrṣah*, in V, 2, 1. Among verbal forms are the third person singulars *īṣe*, *vide*, IV, 1, the first person *stusē*, IV, 1. The curious forms *vijāse*, *sdmnyase*, *bhuvah*, IV, 1, *duham*, V, 3, 2, the subjunctives *dmuṣamsisah*, *pariat*, IV, 1, *jūjosat*, V, 2, 2, *vibhajatha*, V, 1, 1, the injunctives *vidah* (?), IV, 1, *spṛsat* (?) V, 2, 2, *kartana*, V, 2, 2, and perhaps *dvit*, V, 1, 1, the precatives, *apjāsam*, V, 3, 2, *bhujāsam*, V, 1, 1. Of noun constructions may be noted, *jaja samanam*, V, 3, 2, *īar jājām īakṣyantim*, V, 1, 5, *īasaṁ ann*, IV, 1, *prati īam rjīś*, V, 2, 1. In V, 2, 2, *kartana* seems used instead of a dual, in IV, 1, *bratazahai* needs explanation. In V, 1, 1 occur *antarikṣam vānāpyam bhujāsam*, &c., where the predicate adjective follows the gender and number of the nearest noun the object of comparison. The uses of *īam* in that passage, of *maricayah*, and of *īndh* and *sdmajah* in V, 2, 1, are all unusual. The question of the date of the verses in IV, 1, has been dealt with in the note on that passage, and cf. *J R A S*, 1907, pp. 224 sq., Oldenberg *Gott Gel Anz*, 1907, pp. 215 sq.

¹ The Brāhmaṇa parts of the Taittiriya, vimsa Brāhmaṇa the Antarejya Brāhmaṇa, Samhitā and Brāhmaṇa, Maṇḍūkya, 1 XXX and possibly the Kauṣṭhika Brāhmaṇa, Kāṣṭhika Samhitā, the Panca

AITAREYA ĀRANYAKA.

॥ अथ प्रथमारण्यकम् ॥

ADHYĀYA 1.

ओम्' ॥ अथ महाव्रतम् । इन्द्रो वै वृचं हत्वा महानभवद्य-
न्नहानभवत्तन्महाव्रतमभवत्तन्महाव्रतस्य महाव्रतत्वम् । द्वे एत-

¹ In B there precede Adhyāya 1 the following शान्ति verses, incorrectly accented, taken from B¹ मूर्मिमुपसृष्टेदप इडा नम इडा नम अपिभ्यो मन्त्रहृदो मन्त्रपतिभ्यो नमो वो अक्षु देवेभ्यः शिवा नः शक्तमा भव मुमुडोका सरस्वति मा ते व्योम सुवृष्टि । मद्र कर्णेभिः ॥१॥ शन्न इन्द्रापी चक्षु ॥१॥ क्षुपे जनं चक्षु ॥१॥ कया नक्षिच आ-
तिस्रः स्त्रोना पुंघिषी चक्षु ॥ In B the शान्ति verses appear as Adhyāya 9 in Āranyaka III, at fol 191a ओ । नमस्त्रिषाय । ओ उदितशुक्रियन्धे तद्दहमा-
ह्मणि दधे । अमु मानेतिन्द्रियं मयि ओर्म्मयि यशः । सर्वस्व प्राणस्तबल वृत्तिष्ठाम्यनु मा श्रीवृत्तिष्ठस्तु मा यन्तु देवताः । अदव्यश्चक्षुरिपिरम्मनस्सूर्यो ज्योतिषा श्रेष्ठो दौषि मा मा हिंसीः । तच्चतुर्देवहित शुक्रमुचरत् । पथिम शरदश्यतज्जीविम शरदश्य-
तम् । अपि इडा नम इडा नम अपिभ्यो मन्त्रहृदो मन्त्रपतिभ्यो नमो वो अक्षु देवेभ्यः । शिवा नश्यन्तमा भव मुमुडोका सरस्वति मा ते व्योमन्तवृष्टि । मद्रङ्कर्णेभिः चक्षु । शन्न इन्द्रापी चक्षु । क्षुपे जनं चक्षु । कया नक्षिचः कस्त्वा सत्त्वो मदानाम् । अमो यु यः स्त्रोना पुंघिषी मया सप्रथ इति शान्तिश्चान्तिश्चान्ति । इत्युमेदे संहितारखे तृतीयोऽध्यायः । This Adhyāya is not accented at all in B as would appear from Scheffelowitz's reproduction, *Die Apokryphen des Rigveda*, p 167, the accents being wholly omitted from Khila V, 17, 2, onwards as is correctly stated B p 163 In B occur the same verses as in B and B, but in different order First come the verses which are found in B¹, the Rgvedic verses (मद्र) I, 89, 8, (श न) VII, 35, 1, (क्षुपे) VI, 49 1, (कया, कस्त्वा, अमो यु) IV, 31, 1-3, (स्त्रोना) I, 22, 15 being quoted in full Then follow the words उदितस् down to शतम् and मद्र नो अपि

स्याह आज्ये कुर्यादिति हैक आहुरेकमिति त्वेव स्थितम् । प्र वो देवायामय इति राद्धिकामः । विशो विशो वो अतिथिमिति ३६

वातय मनः । ओ शान्तिश्चान्तिश्चान्तिः हरिः ओम् । Instead of सर्वस्य E, S, and the other MSS have सर्वः स, °यित for °यिर, and तम् for तद् A begins like R¹, but adds गृणु° अक् after कर्णेभिः and सुव्रत after अण. It ends पृथिवी मय ओष्ठापिधाना° यसः । इति पूर्वा । At the end of the fifth Āranyaka it has उदितस्— हिसीः as in B, then तद्गुदेवहित अक् । त्वमपे व्रतपा अक् । वाद्गो मनसि— वक्तारम् (as in Āranyaka II, 7) । भद्रं नो अयि वातय मनः । शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः इत्युत्तरशान्तिः ॥२॥ R has, at the end of the fifth Āranyaka, ओ— सद्गृणि as in R¹ Then भद्रं कर्णेभिः गृणुयाम देवाः १ इ न इन्द्रापी मवतामवोमिः १ क्षुपे अण सुव्रत नव्यसीभिः १ कया अयिच आ भुवदिति तिष्ठः सोमा पृथिवी मय १ तद्गुदेवहित मुक्तुच्चरत् १ त्वमपे व्रतपा असि । भद्रं नो अयि वातय मनः । ओ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः । ओ वाद्गो मनसि (&c as in II 7) । १ ओ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः । इति शान्तिपाठः । T has before II, 4 (the beginning of the Aitareya Upanisad) ओ वाद्गो मनसि (&c as in II, 7, with महासीत्) ending ओं शान्तिश्चान्तिश्चान्तिः । Then follows आ अये इया नम इया (&c as in R down to अभी पु शः) ending भद्रं नो अयि वातय मन । ओ शान्तिश्चान्तिश्चान्तिः । The verses are given in full In U, at the end of II, 7, are added verses as in A from उदित to जीवेन शरदः शत followed by त्वमपे व्रतपा असि देव आ मर्त्येष्वा । त्व यक्षीष्वीडः । ओ शान्ति शान्तिः शान्तिः । In S the text is as in R with the addition of ओष्ठापिधाना वक्तुषी दक्षीः परिवृता पथिः । सर्वस्य वाच ईशाना वाक् मामिह वाद्येदिति वायस. २ ओ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥ Of III, 2 5 S², however, has as in R, then follows उदितः— शत as in B, then त्वमपे व्रतपा असि देव आ मर्त्येष्वा । त्व यक्षीष्वीडः । इ नो मिच इ वक्ष्य इ नो भवत्वयमा । इ न इन्द्रो बृहस्पति इ नो विष्णुश्चक्रमः । वाद्गो मनसि (&c as in II 7) । S at the end of the fifth Āranyaka has ओ उदितः— ईडः as in S² then आवदस्व शकुने मद्रमार्चद तृणोमार्सोणं सुमतिं चिकिदि नः । यदुत्पतन्वर्दसि कर्करियेषा बृहर्ददेम विदर्षे सुवीरताः । शतधारमुत्तमधीयमाण विप्रथित पितर वक्तारनाम् । मेळि मर्दन्त पिनीरुपस्ते न रौदसी पिपृत सत्यवाचम् । Then comes वाद्गो &c as in II 7, ending ओ शान्ति शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥ In one MS (क्षचित् पुस्तके) the verse शतधारम् follows II 7, instead of preceding it Both

पुष्टिकामः^२ । पुष्टिर्वै विशः पुष्टिमान्भवतीति । अतिथिमिति
 पदं भवति नैतत्कुर्यादित्याहुरीश्वरोऽतिथिरेव चरितोः । तदु
 ह स्माह कुर्यादेव । यो वै भवति यः श्रेष्ठतामंश्नुते स वा अति-
 थिर्भवति । न वा असन्तमांतिथ्यायाद्रियन्ते । तस्मादु काममे-
 वैतत्कुर्यात् । स^३ यद्येतत्कुर्यादांगन्म वृत्रहन्तममित्येतं तृचं
 प्रथमं कुर्यात् । एतद्वा अहरीप्सन्तः संवत्सरमांसेते त आग-
 छन्ति । त एतेऽनुष्टुप्शीर्षाणस्तयस्तृचा भवन्ति ब्रह्म वै गायत्री
 वागनुष्टुप्ब्रह्मणैव तद्वाचं संधाति । अवोध्यग्निः समिधा
 जनानामिति कीर्तिकामः । होताजनिष्ट चेतन इति प्रजापशु-
 कामः ॥१॥

अग्निं नरो दीधितिभिररण्योरित्यन्नाद्यकामः । अग्निर्वै
 अन्नादः । चिरतरमिव वा इतरेष्वान्येष्वग्निमागच्छन्त्येषेह मुखत
 एवाग्निमागच्छन्ति मुखतोऽन्नाद्यमश्नुते मुखतः पाप्मानमपघ्नते ।
 हस्तच्युती जनयन्नेति जातवदेतस्माद्वा अहो यजमानो जायते
 तस्माज्जातवत् । तानि चत्वारि छन्दांसि भवन्ति चतुष्पादा वै

here and at the beginning the verses in S are accented with one or two exceptions in
 the case of the verses not in the R̥gveda. There can be no doubt that these verses
 form no integral part of the *Antareya Āraṇyaka*. Neither B², D, F, G, nor L contains the
 verses. For शिषा ऋः see *Atharvaveda*, VII, 68, 3, with Whitney's note तच्चकु^३
 is *R̥gveda*, VII, 66, 16. See also *Sāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, VII, 1, and *Gṛhya Sūtra*, VI, 4,
 with Oldenberg's note. *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*, I, 30, has पुनर्मर्गमेत्विच्छिपम् । पुनरायुः
 पुनर्मर्गः ।

^२ bis in F, G.

^३ श्रेष्ठताम् F, G.

^४ असंमा^३ L.

^५ स यद्येतत्कुर्यात् om. G.

^६ संवत्सररम् G.

^७ जनान् F.

^१ आगच्छति F, G.

पशवः पशूनामवरूढौ । तानि चीणि छन्दांसि भवन्ति वयो वा
 इमे त्रिवृतो लोका एषामेव लोकानामभिजित्यै । ते^१ डे छन्दसी
 भवतः प्रतिष्ठाया एव । द्विप्रतिष्ठो वै पुरुषश्चतुष्पादाः पशवो
 यजमानमेव तद्विप्रतिष्ठं चतुष्पात्सु पशुषु प्रतिष्ठापयति । ताः
 पराग्वचनेन पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति^२ पञ्चविंशोऽयं पुरुषो दश
 हस्त्या अङ्गुलयो दश पाद्या द्वा ऊरू^३ द्वा वाहू आत्मीय^४
 पञ्चविंशस्त्वमिममात्मानं पञ्चविंशं संस्कुरुते । अथो पञ्चविंशं^५
 वा एतदहः पञ्चविंश एतस्याहू^६ स्तोमस्तत्समेन समं प्रतिपद्यते
 तस्माद्दे एव पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति^७ । तास्त्रिः प्रथमया चिरुत्तमयै-
 कया न विंशन्यूनाक्षरा विराट् । न्यूने वै रेतः सिच्यते न्यूने
 प्राणा^८ न्यूनेऽन्नाद्यं प्रतिष्ठितमेतेषां कामानामवरूढौ । एता-
 न्कामानवरुन्धे य एवं वेद । ता अभिसंपद्यन्ते बृहतीं च विराजं
 च छन्दो यैतस्याहूः संपत्तामथो अनुष्टुभमनुष्टुबायतनानि ह्य-
 ज्यानि ॥२॥

गायत्रं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुस्तेजो वै ब्रह्मवर्चसं गायत्री
 तेजस्वी ब्रह्मवर्चसी भवतीति । शीष्णिहं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहु-
 रायुर्वो उष्णिगायुष्मान्भवतीति । आनुष्टुभं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुः

^१ लोकां नाम L^२ om F, G^३ भवति F G^४ उरू L^५ आत्मीय A^६ पञ्चविंश L^७ अह स्तोमस् D ■ F ■ L here

and usually The evidence of the MSS for the dropping of visarga before s and
 a hard consonant is so strong that the practice has been followed throughout after
 the example of Prof Macdonell's *Rigveda* I xxvi see above ¶ 10 R and S
 retain visarga

^८ भवति F ■^९ प्राणा K Cf I 3 7 a 2

स्रवं वा अनुष्टुप्श्वन्स्याशा इति । बार्हतं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुः
 श्रीर्वै बृहती श्रीमान्भवतीति । पाङ्क्तं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुरन्नं वै
 पङ्क्तिरन्नवांभवतीति । चैष्टुभं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुर्वीर्यं वै त्रिष्टु-
 वीर्यवान्भवतीति । जागतं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुर्जागता वै पशवः
 पशुमान्भवतीति । तदु गायत्रमेव कुर्याद्ब्रह्म वै गायत्री ब्रह्मतद-
 हर्ब्रह्मणैव तद्ब्रह्म प्रतिपद्यते । तदु माधुछन्दसम् । मधु ह स वा
 षष्ठिभ्यो मधुछन्दाश्छन्दति तन्मधुछन्दसो मधुछन्दस्त्वम् । अथो¹
 अन्नं वै मधु सर्वे² वै मधु³ सर्वे वै कामा मधु तद्यन्माधुछन्दसं
 शंसति सर्वेषां कामानामवरुह्यै । सर्वान्कामानवरुह्ये⁴ य एवं
 वेद । तद्वैकाहिकं रूपसमृद्धं बहु वा एतस्मिन्नहनि किञ्च किञ्च⁵
 वारणं क्रियते शान्त्या एव शान्तिर्वै प्रतिष्ठैकाहः शान्त्यामेव तत्प्र-
 तिष्ठायामन्ततः प्रतितिष्ठन्ति । प्रतितिष्ठति⁶ य एवं वेद येषां
 चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति ॥३॥

वायवा याहि दर्शतेमे सोमा अरंकृता इत्येतद्वा अहरं
 यजमानाय च देवेभ्यश्च । अरं हास्मा एतदहर्भवति य एवं
 वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । इन्द्रवायू इमे सुता आ
 यातमुप निष्कृतमिति यद्वै निष्कृतं तत्संस्कृतम् । आ हास्येन्द्र-

¹ अथो L.² bis in R.³ यान् R.⁴ अरुह्ये is the

regular form in R, S, and the MSS., and so is followed, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 231. On the other hand अरुह्ये, which is always read in R and which occurs sporadically in the MSS., is simply an example of the constant tendency of MSS. to reduce consonant groups, and is incorrect. S has अरुह्ये throughout. See also Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 269. ⁵ om. R. - ⁶ corr. from प्रतिष्ठन्ति A.

¹ तिष्कृतम् A.

वायू संस्कृतं गच्छतो य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता
 शंसति । मित्रं हुवे पूतदक्षं धियं धृताचीं^१ साधन्तेति^२ वाग्वै
 धीर्धृताची^३ । वाचमेवास्मिंस्तद्दधाति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं
 विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । अश्विना यज्वरीरिष इत्यन्नं वा इषो
 ऽन्नाद्यस्यावरुह्ये । आ यातं रुद्रवर्तनी इत्या हास्याश्विनौ यज्ञं
 गच्छतो य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । इन्द्रा
 याहि चित्रभानविन्द्रा याहि धियेषित इन्द्रा याहि तूतुजान
 इत्यायाह्यायाहीति शंसति । आ हास्येन्द्रो यज्ञं गच्छति य एवं^४
 वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । ओमासश्चपैणीधृतो
 विश्वे देवास आ गतेत्या हास्य विश्वे देवा हवं गच्छन्ति य एवं
 वेद^५ येषां चैवं^६ विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । दाश्यांसी दाशुषः
 सुतमिति यदाह ददुषो^७ ददुषः सुतमित्येव तदाह । ददति^८
 हास्मै तं कामं देवा यत्काम एतच्छंसति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं
 विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । पावका नः सरस्वती यज्ञं वष्टु धिया-
 वसुरिति वाग्वै धियावसुः । वाचमेवास्मिंस्तद्दधाति य एवं वेद
 येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । यज्ञं वष्टुति यदाह यज्ञं
 वहत्वित्येव तदाह । ताः पराग्वचनेनैकविंशतिर्भवन्त्येकविंशोऽयं
 पुरुषो दश हस्त्या अङ्गुलयो दश पाद्या आत्मेकविंशस्तमिममा-
 त्मानमेकविंशं संस्कुप्ते । तास्त्रिः प्रथमया चिरुत्तमया पञ्चविं-

^१ धृताची A.^२ साधयन्तेति B; साधतेति G^४ धीताची F.^५ om. F.^६ ददुषा G.^७ तदति K.^८ भवति L.

शतिर्भवन्ति¹ पञ्चविंश¹⁰ आत्मा पञ्चविंशः प्रजापतिर्दश हस्त्या
अङ्गुलयो दश पाद्या द्वा ऊरू द्वौ बाहू आत्मेव पञ्चविंशस्त-
मिममात्मानं पञ्चविंशं संस्फुल्लते । अथो¹¹ पञ्चविंशं वा
एतदहः पञ्चविंश एतस्याह स्तोमस्तत्समेन समं प्रतिपद्यते
तस्माद्दे एव पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति भवन्ति ॥४॥

॥ इत्यैतरेयप्रथमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥¹²

ADHYĀYA 2.

‘आ त्वा रथं यथोतय इदं वसो सुतमन्थ इति मरुत्वतीयस्य
प्रतिपदनुचरौ । ऐकाहिकी रूपसमृद्धौ बहु वा एतस्मिन्नहनि
किञ्च¹ किञ्च वारणं क्रियते शान्त्या एव, शान्तिर्वै प्रतिष्टैकाहः शा-
न्त्यामेव तत्प्रतिष्ठायामन्ततः प्रतितिष्ठन्ति । प्रतितिष्ठति य एवं
वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्वोता शंसति । इन्द्र नेदीय एदिहि प्र
सू तिरा शचीभिर्मे त उक्थिन इत्युक्थं² वा एतदहस्कथवदू-
पसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । प्रैतु ब्रह्मणस्पतिरक्षा वीरमिति वीर-
वदूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । उत्तिष्ठ ब्रह्मणस्पते³ सुवीर्यमिति

¹ पञ्चविंशति भन्ति A

पञ्चविंशस्—संस्फुल्लते.

¹⁰ पञ्चविंशं A.

¹¹ After this P repeats

पञ्चविंशस्—संस्फुल्लते. ¹² Text, A, B, इति प्रथमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः L ;
इति प्रथम आरण्ये प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥१॥ K, ओं प्रथमोऽध्यायः F ; प्रथमोऽध्यायः
D, G ; हरिः ओं B, इत्यैतरेयब्राह्मणारण्यकाण्डे प्रथमारण्यके प्रथमाध्याये चतुर्थः
खण्डः ॥४॥ इति बृहचक्राह्यारण्यकाण्डे प्रथमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥१॥

It has been followed in the text. It is of course certain that the divisions and
colophons have no claim to be regarded as contemporaneous with the composition of
the work, in which the only divisions were probably the Adhyāyas and Āraṇyakas.

¹ किं च to एतद् is represented by ° in A, and thus is regularly done when
a passage is repeated or words are repeated. The several instances are not noted
separately hereafter. ² उक्थे F. ³ रूपं F. ⁴ ब्रह्मणस्पते—प्र ब्रूषं

वीर्यवद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । प्र नूनं^१ ब्रह्मणस्पतिर्मन्त्रं वद-
 त्युक्त्यमित्युक्तं^२ वा एतदहर्ब्रह्मणस्पतिवद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् ।
 अग्निर्नेता स वृचहेति वार्वर्षमिन्द्ररूपमैन्द्रमेतदहरेतस्याहो
 रूपम् । त्वं सोम क्रतुभिः सुक्रतुर्भूस्त्वं वृषा वृषत्वेभिर्महितेति
 वृषखट्वा इन्द्रस्य रूपमैन्द्रमेतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम् । पिबन्त्यपो
 ऽत्यं न मिहे वि नयन्ति वाजिनमिति वाजिमत्वा इन्द्रस्य रूप-
 मैन्द्रमेतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम् । अथो उत्सं दुहन्ति स्तनयन्तम-
 क्षितमिति स्तनयत्वा इन्द्रस्य रूपमैन्द्रमेतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम् ।
 प्र व इन्द्राय बृहत इति यज्ञै बृहत्तन्महन्महद्बद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो
 रूपम् । बृहदिन्द्राय गायतेति यज्ञै बृहत्तन्महन्महद्बद्रूपसमृद्धमे-
 तस्याहो रूपम् । नकिः^३ सुदासो रथं पर्यास न रीरमदिति
 पर्यस्तवद्रान्तिमद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । सर्वान्प्रगाथाञ्छंसति
 सर्वेषामहामाग्निं सर्वेषामुक्त्यानां सर्वेषां^४ पृष्ठानां सर्वेषां शस्त्राणां
 सर्वेषां प्रउगाणां सर्वेषां सवनानाम् ॥१॥^५

असत्सु मे जरितः साभिवेगः सत्यधृतमिति शंसति सत्यं
 वा एतदहः सत्यवद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । तदु वासुक्रं ब्रह्म
 वै वसुक्रो ब्रह्मेतदहर्ब्रह्मणैव तद्ब्रह्म प्रतिपद्यते । तदाहुरथ कस्मा-

on 1 F, G, because of ब्रह्मणस्पतिः following

^१ इत्युक्त्य ७२ G, वदुक्^२ A

^२ इन्द्ररूपा F, G

^३ किं G

^४ सर्वेषा पृष्ठाना ७२ F

^५ This Khandā

is numbered 5 in A, D, E F, G K, L, 5 at the end of the commentary in R, and
 1 at the end of the text. In S both numbers are given throughout. I have kept
 the lower number for the sake of convenience, as references to the Aitareya have in
 the past been based on R Cf Z D W G, ALII, 171

द्यासुक्तेणैतन्मरुत्वतीयं प्रतिपद्यत इति न ह वा एतदन्यो वसु-
क्रान्मरुत्वतीयमुदयच्छन्न विव्याचेति तस्माद्यासुक्तेणैवैतन्मरुत्वतीयं
प्रतिपद्यते । तदनिरुक्तं प्राजापत्यं शंसत्यनिरुक्ती वै प्रजापतिः
प्रजापतेराणै । सकृदिन्द्रं निराह तेनैन्द्रादूपाच्च प्रच्यवते । पिवा
सोममभि यमुय तर्दे¹ इति शंसति । ऊर्वं गथं महि गृणान
इन्द्रेति महद्दूपासमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । तदु भारद्वाजं भरद्वाजो
ह वा ऋषीणामनूचानतमो दीर्घजीवितमस्तपस्वितम आस
स एतेन सूक्तेन पाप्मानमपाहत तद्यज्ञारद्वाजं शंसति पाप्मनो
ऽपहत्या अनूचानो दीर्घजीवी तपस्यसानीति तस्माद्भारद्वाजं
शंसति । कया शुभा सवयसः सनीळा इति शंसति । आ शसते
प्रति हर्यन्त्युक्थेत्युक्थं वा एतदहर्कथवदूपासमृद्धमेतस्याहो
रूपम् । तदु कयाशुभीयमेतद्वै संज्ञानं सन्तानि सूक्तं यत्कयाशु-
भीयमेतेन ह वा इन्द्रोऽगस्त्यो मरुतस्ते समजानत तद्यत्कया-
शुभीयं शंसति संज्ञात्या एव । तद्यायुषं तद्योऽस्य प्रियः² स्यात्कु-
र्यादेवास्य कयाशुभीयम् । मरुताँ इन्द्र वृषभो रणायेति शंसति ।
इन्द्र वृषभ इति वृषखद्या इन्द्रस्य रूपमैन्द्रमेतदहरेतस्याहो
रूपम् । तदु विश्वामित्रं विश्वस्य ह वै सिधं विश्वामित्र आस ।
विश्वं हास्म मित्रं भवति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्वीता
शंसति । जनिष्ठा उयः सहसे तुरायेति निविडानमैकाहिकं

¹ वसुक्तेणैतन् ० वसुक्तेण तन् Γ, वाशु³ B ² वासुकान् E ³ वासु-
क्तेणैतन् ॥ Γ, वासुक्तेणैतन् ॥ ⁴ दर्द K ⁵ प्रिय स्याद् F, G The
omission occurs sporadically in the MSS but has no sufficient authority to justify its
adoption

रूपसमृद्धं बहु वा एतस्मिन्नहनि^१ किञ्च किञ्च वारणं क्रियते
 शान्त्या एव शान्तिर्वै प्रतिष्ठैकाहः शान्त्यामेव तत्प्रतिष्ठायामन्ततः
 प्रतितिष्ठन्ति । प्रतितिष्ठति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्योता
 शंसन्ति । ताः पराग्वचनेन सप्तनवतिर्भवन्ति सा या नवतिस्त्रि-
 स्रस्तास्त्रिंशिन्यो विराजोऽथ याः सप्तानियन्ति यैवैषा प्रशंसा
 साशस्य^२ तस्या एव । तास्त्रिः प्रथमया चिरुत्तमयैकशतं भवन्ति
 पञ्चाङ्गुलयश्चतुष्पदौ द्वे कक्षसी दोष्वाश्चष्टांसफलकं च सा
 पञ्चविंशतिः पञ्चविंशानोतराणि स्यद्गानि तच्छतमात्मैकशत-
 तमः । यच्छतं तदायुरिन्द्रियं वीर्यं तेजो यजमान एकशततम
 आयुषीन्द्रिये वीर्यं तेजसि प्रतिष्ठितः । तास्त्रिष्टुभमभिसंपद्यन्ते
 त्रैष्टुभो हि मध्यन्दिनः ॥२॥^३

तदाहुः किं मेहस्य मेहत्वमित्ययं^४ वै मेहो योऽयं पवत
 एष^५ क्षेषु लोकेषु^६ मेहत^७ इति^८ तत्मेहस्य मेहत्वम् । एकं
 फलकं स्यादित्याहुरेकधा क्षेवायं वायुः पवतेऽस्य रूपेणेति ।
 तत्तन्नादृत्यम् । चीणि फलकानि स्युरित्याहुस्तयो वा इमे
 चिवृत्तो लोका एषां रूपेणेति । तत्तन्नादृत्यम् । द्वे एव स्यातां
 द्वौ वा इमौ लोकावज्ञातमाविव दृश्येते य^९ उ एने क्षन्तरेणा-

^१ एतस्मिन् A ^२ प्रथमाशस्य G ^३ Numbered 6 in A D E F, G K, L
 and also in B in text In B in commentary = 2

^४ From अयं इति on F From मेहत्वं to क्षेषु on G F has मेहत्वं

^५ एष R (by misprint) A, D E, K, L S, and R in commentary have text)

^६ लोके L ^७ मेहत G ^८ ये R in text.

काशः सोऽन्तरिक्षलोकस्तस्माद्दे एव स्याताम् । औदुम्बरे स्या-
तामूर्वा अन्नाद्यमुदुम्बर ऊर्जोऽन्नाद्यस्यावरूढौ । मध्यत उद्भृते
स्यातां मध्यतो वै प्रजा अन्नं धिनोति मध्यत एव तदन्नाद्यस्य
यजमानं दधाति । उभयो रज्जवो भवन्ति दक्षिणाश्च सव्याश्च^६
दक्षिणा वा एकेषां पशूनां रज्जवः सव्या एकेषां तद्यदुभयो
रज्जवो भवन्त्युभयेषां पशूनामासौ । दार्व्यः^७ स्युर्दर्भो वा ओष-
धीनामपहतपाप्मा^८ तस्माद्दार्व्यः^७ स्युः ॥३॥

अरलिमात्र उपरि भूमेः^१ प्रेहः^२ स्यादित्याहुरेतावता वै
स्वर्गा लोकाः संमिता इति । तत्तन्नादृत्यम् । प्रादेशमात्रे स्या-
दित्याहुरेतावता वै प्राणाः संमिता इति । तत्तन्नादृत्यम् । मुष्टि-
मात्रे स्यादेतावता वै सर्वमन्नाद्यं क्रियत एतावता सर्वमन्नाद्य-
मभिपन्नं तस्मान्मुष्टिमात्र एव स्यात् । पुरस्तात्प्रत्यञ्चं प्रेहमधि-
रोहेदित्याहुरेतस्य रूपेण य एष तपति पुरस्ताद्येष इमाँल्लोकान्प्र-
त्यङ्मधिरोहतीति । तत्तन्नादृत्यम् । तिर्यञ्चमधिरोहेदित्याहुस्तिर्यञ्चं
वा अश्वमधिरोहन्ति तेनो सर्वान्कामानवाप्नुवामेति । तत्तन्ना-
दृत्यम् । अन्वञ्चमधिरोहेदित्याहुरनूचीं वै नावमधिरोहन्ति नौ-
र्वेषा स्वर्गयाणी यत्प्रेह इति तस्मादन्वञ्चमेवाधिरोहेत् । छुवुके-
नोपस्पृशेच्छुको हैवं वृक्षमधिरोहति स उ वयसामन्नादतम इति
तस्माच्छुवुकेनोपस्पृशेत् । बाहुभ्यामधिरोहेदेवं श्येनो वयांस्यभि-

^६ sm. F.^७ दार्व्य D, E, F, G, K, L.^८ अपहतपाप्मा F.^२ Numbered १ in A, D, E, F, G, K, L.^१ भूमे F.^२ प्रेह D, E, F, G, K, L.

निविशत एवं वृक्षं स उ वयसां वीर्यवत्तम इति तस्माद्वाहु-
 भ्यामधिरोहेत् । अस्यै पादं नोच्छिन्द्याच्चेदस्यै प्रतिष्ठाया उच्छिद्या
 इति । प्रेहं होताधिरोहन्त्योदुसरीमासन्दीमुद्गाता वृषा वै प्रेहो
 योषासन्दी तन्मिथुनं मिथुनमेव तदुक्थमुखे करोति प्रजात्ये ।
 प्रजायते प्रजया पशुभिर्य एवं वेद । अथान्नं वै प्रेहः^३ श्रीरा-
 सन्धन्नं चैव तच्छ्रियं चान्वधिरोहतः^४ । वृसीर्होचकाः समधि-
 रोहन्ति सप्तलकाः । समुत्तृष्य वा श्लोपधिवन्त्यतयः फलं
 गृह्णाति^५ तद्यदेतस्मिन्नहनि सर्वशः समधिरोहन्तीपमेव तदूर्ज-
 मन्नाद्यमधिरोहन्त्यूर्जोऽन्नाद्यस्यावस्ति । वपटृत्याचरोहेदित्याहुः ।
 तत्तन्नादृत्यम् । अकृता वै सापचितिर्यामपश्यते करोति । निगृह्य
 भक्षमवरोहेदित्याहुः । तत्तन्नादृत्यम् । अकृता वै सापचितिर्या-
 मधृष्टाय^६ करोति । प्रतिख्याय भक्षमवरोहेदेषा वा अपचि-
 तिर्या^७ पश्यते करोति तस्मात्प्रतिख्यायैव भक्षमवरोहेत् ।
 प्राङ्वरोहेत् । प्राग्वै देवरेतसं^८ प्रजायते तस्मात्प्राङ्वरोहेदव-
 रोहेत् ॥४॥^{११}

॥ इत्यैतरेयप्रथमारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥^{१२}

^३ प्रेह D, E, &c ^४ अधिरोहतः A, D, E, F, G, K, L, S, the commentary shows the reading, yet R has 'रोहते. ^५ गृह्णाति R in text. ^६ अधृष्टा F, G. ^७ र्यामपश्यते D, E. ^८ प्राङ् R in text. ^९ देवरेतः सं (?) S.
^{१०} प्राङ् L. ^{११} Numbered 8 in A, D, E, F, G, K, L. ^{१२} Text, A, L, R;
 no colophon, E; इति द्वितीयोऽध्यायः D; द्वितीयोऽध्यायः F, G; इति प्रथम आरण्ये
 द्वितीयोऽध्यायः K.

ADHYĀVA 3.

हिङ्कारेणैतदहः प्रतिपद्येतेत्याहुः । ब्रह्म वै हिङ्कारो ब्रह्मैत-
 दहर्ब्रह्मणैव तद्ब्रह्म प्रतिपद्यते य एवं वेद । यदेव हिङ्कारेण
 प्रतिपद्यता३इ वृषा वै हिङ्कारो योषर्त्तन्मिथुनं मिथुनमेव
 तदुक्थमुखे करोति प्रजात्यै । प्रजायते प्रजया पशुभिर्य एवं
 वेद । यदेव हिङ्कारेण प्रतिपद्यता३इ यथा वा श्मिरेवं ब्रह्मणो
 हिङ्कारो यद्वै किञ्चाभियाभितितृत्सत्यभ्येवैतच्चृणस्येवम् । यं कामं
 कामयते हिङ्कारेणाभ्येवैनं तृणञ्चि य एवं वेद । यदेव हिङ्कारेण
 प्रतिपद्यता३इ वाचो वा एषा व्यावृत्तिर्देवै^१ च मानुष्यै च यद्धि-
 ङ्कारः । स यद्धिङ्कृत्य प्रतिपद्यते वाचमेव तद्वावर्तयति दैवीं
 च मानुषीं च ॥१॥^२

तदाहुः कैतस्याहः प्रतिपदिति । मनश्च वाक्चेति ब्रूयात् ।
 सर्वेऽन्यस्मिन्कामाः^३ श्रिताः सर्वानन्या^४ कामान्दुहे । मनसि वै
 सर्वे कामाः श्रिता मनसा हि सर्वान्कामान्ध्यायति । सर्वे
 हास्मिन्कामाः श्रयन्ते य एवं वेद । वाग्वै सर्वान्कामान्दुहे वाचा
 हि सर्वान्कामान्वदति । सर्वान्हास्मै कामान्वाग्दुहे य एवं वेद ।
 तदाहुर्नैतदहर्चचा न यजुषा न सामा प्रत्यक्षात्प्रतिपद्येत नर्चो

^१ किं पाधियामिति तृत्सति K.^२ देवै G.^३ Numbered 9 in

A, E, K, L. F and G have both १ and ९. D has १

^४ सर्वै F.^५ कामा E, and so regularly when f or s is followed by

a semivowel or soft mute

^६ अन्यान् S.^७ वाग्—वेद repeated in F, G

न यजुषो न साम्न इयादिति । तदेता एव^१ व्याहृतीः पुरस्ता-
ज्जपेत् । भूर्भुवः^२ स्वरित्येता वाच व्याहतय इमे त्रयो वेदा
भूरित्येव ऋग्वेदो भुव इति यजुर्वेदः स्वरिति सामवेदः । तन्नर्चा
न यजुषा न साम्ना प्रत्यक्षात्प्रतिपद्यते नर्चो न यजुषो न साम्न
एति ॥२॥^३

तदिति प्रतिपद्यते तत्तदिति वा अन्नमन्नमेव तदभिप्रति-
पद्यते । एतां वाच प्रजापतिः प्रथमां वाचं व्याहरदेकाक्षरद्व-
क्षरां ततेति तातेति । तथैवैतत्कुमारः प्रथमवादी वाचं व्याहर-
त्येकाक्षरद्वक्षरां ततेति तातेति । तथैव तत्तत्तवत्या^४ वाचा प्रति-
पद्यते) तदुक्तमृषिणा । बृहस्यो प्रथमं वाचो अयमित्येतद्वेव
प्रथमं वाचो अयम् । यत्परत नामधेयं दधाना इति वाचा हि
नामधेयानि धीयन्ते । यदेषां श्रेष्ठं यदरिप्रमासीदित्येतद्वेव श्रेष्ठमे-
तदरिप्रम् । प्रेणा तदेषां निहितं गुहाविरितीदमु ह गुहाध्यात्म-
मिमा देवता अद ॥ आविरधिदेवतमित्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति ॥३॥^५

तदिदास भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठमिति प्रतिपद्यत एतद्वाच भुवनेषु
ज्येष्ठम् । यतो जज्ञ उयस्वेयनृम्ण इत्यतो होष जात उयस्वे-
यनृम्णः । सद्यो जज्ञानो निरिष्याति शबूनिति सद्यो होष
जातः पाप्मानमपाहत । अनु यं विश्वे मदन्त्यूमा इति भूतानि

^१ om. B^२ सुव E.^३ तन्नर्चा A^४ Numbered 10 in A, E, K, L ;

10 and 2 in F, G ; 2 in D.

^५ यदेष S¹²³, तदेवे om F.^६ अद्वक्षर om. R in text^७ तत्तवत्या L^८ मत्त A.^९ Numbered 11 in A, E, G, K, L, 11, 3 in F, 3 in D. See I, 3, 6

वै विश्व ऊमास्त एनमनुमदन्पुद्गादुद्गादिति । वावृधानः
 श्वसा भूर्योजा इति एष वै वावृधानः श्वसा भूर्योजाः ।
 श्चुर्दासाय भियसं दधातीति सर्वे^१ ह्येतस्माद्वीभाय^२ । अथ्यनञ्च
 व्यन्तञ्च सस्त्रीति यञ्च प्राणि^३ यच्चाप्राणकमित्येव तदाह । सं ते
 नवन्त प्रभृता मदेध्विति तव सर्वे वश इत्येव तदाह । वि
 क्रतुमपि वृञ्जन्ति विश्व इति त्वयीमानि सर्वाणि भूतानि
 सर्वाणि मनांसि सर्वे क्रतवोऽपि वृञ्जन्तीत्येव तदाह । द्विर्यदेते
 चिर्भवन्पूमा इति द्वौ वै सन्तौ मिथुनौ प्रजायेते प्रजात्यै^४ ।
 प्रजायते^५ प्रजया षण्भिर्ये एवं वेद । स्वादोः स्वादीयः स्वादुना
 सृजा समिति मिथुनं वै स्वादु प्रजा स्वादु मिथुनेनैव तत्प्रजां
 संसृजति^६ । अदः सु मधु मधुनाभि गोधीरिति मिथुनं वै मधु
 प्रजा मधु मिथुनेनैव तत्प्रजामभियुध्यति । तदुक्तमृषिणा । स्वां
 यज्ञनूं तन्वामैरयतेत्यस्यां शारीर्यामिमां छन्दोमयीमित्येव तदाह ।
 अथो तनूरेव तन्वो अस्तु भेषजमित्यस्यै शारीर्या इयं छन्दोम-
 यीत्येव तदाह । तस्यै यान्यष्टावक्षराणि सा गायत्री यान्येकादश
 सा त्रिष्टुब्धानि द्वादश सा जगत्यथ यानि दश सा विराड्दृष्टिन्येषु
 त्रिष्टु^७ छन्दःसु प्रतिष्ठिता । पुरुष इति अक्षरं ॥ ३ ॥ विराजि ।
 एतानि वाच^८ सर्वाणि छन्दांसि यान्येतानि विरादुत्तुर्थान्येवसु
 हैवैवं विदुष एतदहः सर्वेऽछन्दोभिः प्रतिपन्नं भवति ॥ ४ ॥^९

^१ एवं A.^२ उद्गाद once only in F^३ श्चुर् E. in text^४ सर्वे—दीमाय om. S, clearly by an oversight.^५ प्राण G.^६ वृञ्जति

R in text.

^७ प्राजाति D, om. G.^८ om G.^९ यञ्जति A.^{१०} भेषजं E; भेषजा F, G.^{११} त्रिष्टु G^{१२} वाच F.^{१३} Numbered 12

in A, E, K, L, 12, 4 in F, G, 4 in D R has 4 in text and 12 in commentary

ता नदेन विहरति^१ । पुरुषो वै नदस्तस्मात्पुरुषो वदन्सर्वः
 संनदतीव । नदं व ओदतीनामिती^२३ आपो वा ओदत्यो या
 दिव्यास्ता हीदं सर्वमुन्दन्यापो वा ओदत्यो या मुख्यास्ता हीदं
 सर्वमन्नाद्यमुन्दन्ति । नदं योयुवतीनामिती^३३ आपो वाव
 योयुवत्यो या अन्तरिक्षास्ता हि पोभूयन्त इवापो वाव योयु-
 वत्यो याः स्वेदते^४ ता हि सरीसृथन्त इव । पतिं वो अघ्नाना-
 मिती^३३ आपो वा अघ्ना या अपेर्धूमाज्जायन्त आपो वा
 अघ्ना याः शिघ्रात्मसृज्यन्ते । धेनूनामिषुध्यसीती^३३ आपो वाव
 धेनवस्ता हीदं सर्वं धिन्वन्तीषुध्यसीति यदाह पतीयसीत्येव
 तदाह । विष्टुभं चानुष्टुभं च विहरति वृषा वै चिष्टुव्योषानुष्टुभ-
 निष्टुनं तस्मादपि पुरुषो जायां विस्वा कृत्स्नतरमिवात्मानं
 मन्यते । तास्त्रिः प्रथमया पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति पञ्चविंश आत्मा
 पञ्चविंशः प्रजापतिर्देश^५ हस्त्या अङ्गुलयो दश पाद्या द्वा
 ऊरू द्वौ बाहू आन्मिव पञ्चविंशस्तमिममात्मानं पञ्चविंशं
 संस्क्रुते । अथो पञ्चविंशं वा एतदहः पञ्चविंश एतस्याह
 स्तोमस्तत्समेन समं प्रतिपद्यते तस्माद्दे एव पञ्चविंशतिर्भ-
 वन्ति ॥ ५ ॥^६

^१ विरहति E.^२ अदति A.^३ सिदति A, D, E, F, G, K, L, S.

स्वेदते B.

^४ पतीयसीति D, E, F, G.^५ The words after दश are

omitted by * in B.

^६ Numbered १३ in A, E, K, L; १३, ६ in F; १३, ६ in G;

|| in D. E has १३ in text, but ३ in commentary.

तदिति प्रतिपद्यते तत्तदिति वा अन्त्रमन्त्रमेव तदभिप्रति-
पद्यते । एतां वाच^१ प्रजापतिः प्रथमां वाचं व्याहरदेकाक्षर-
द्व्यक्षरां ततेति तातेति । तथैवैतत्कुमारः प्रथमवादी^२ वाचं
व्याहरत्येकाक्षरद्व्यक्षरां ततेति तातेति । तथैव तत्ततवत्या^३ वाचा
प्रतिपद्यते । तदुक्तमृषिणा । बृहस्पते प्रथमं वाचो अयमित्ये-
तद्वेव प्रथमं वाचो अयम् । यत्प्रैरत नामधेयं दधाना इति
वाचा हि नामधेयानि धीयन्ते । यदेषां श्रेष्ठं यदरिप्रमासी-
दित्येतद्वेव श्रेष्ठमेतदरिप्रम् । प्रेणा तदेषां निहितं गुहाविरि-
तीदमु ह गुहाध्यात्ममिमा देवता अद च आविरधिदैवतमित्ये-
तत्तदुक्तं भवति ॥६॥^४

तदिदास भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठमिति प्रतिपद्यते यद्वै ज्येष्ठं तन्महन्म-
हद्ब्रह्मसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । तां सु ते^५ कीर्तिं मघवन्म-
हित्वेति महद्ब्रह्मसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । भूय इद्वानृधे वीर्या-
येति वीर्यवद्ब्रह्मसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । नृणां तु नृतमं गीर्भि-
रुक्थैरित्युक्थं वा एतदहर्ब्रह्मवद्ब्रह्मसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् ।
न्यूनाक्षरे प्रथमे पदे विहरति न्यूने वै रेतः सिच्यते न्यूने^६ प्राणा
न्यूनेऽन्नाद्यं प्रतिष्ठितमेतेषां कामानामवस्थी । एतान्कामानव-

^१ In A all from वाच — अधिदैवतम् as represented by * It has only तदिति
प्रतिपद्यते भवति See I, 3, 3 ^२ प्रथमवाचं only L ^३ व्याहर इति B in
text, व्याहरत्ये G and D pr. man. ^४ तदवत्या F, G. ^५ Numbered 14 in
A, E, K, L, 14, 6 in F, G; 6 in D It is numbered 4 in B because the number
13 of the previous section was in the commentary printed as 3!

^६ सुता ते F, G

^७ न्यूने प्राणा on F; प्राणा B Cf I, 1, 2, n 10

रुन्धे य एवं वेद । हे दशाक्षरे भवत उभयोरन्नाद्ययोरुपास्यै यच्च
पञ्चदशापादकमिति । अष्टादशाष्टादशाक्षराणि भवन्ति यानि
दश नव प्राणा आत्मैव दशमः सात्मनः संस्कृतिरष्टावष्टा
उद्यन्ते । अश्रुते यद्यत्कामयते य एवं वेद ॥७॥^३

ता नदेन विहरति । प्राणो वै नदस्तस्मात्प्राणो नदन्सर्वः
संनदतीव । नदं व ओदतीनामिती^३ उष्णिगक्षरैर्भवत्यनुष्टुप्पा-
दैरायुर्वा उष्णिग्वागनुष्टुप् । तदस्मिन्नायुष्य वाचं च दधाति ।
तास्त्रिः प्रथमया पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति पञ्चविंश आत्मा पञ्चविंशः
प्रजापतिर्दश हस्त्या अङ्गुलयो दश पाद्या द्वा ऊरू द्वौ बाहू
आत्मैव पञ्चविंशस्तमिममात्मानं पञ्चविंशं संस्कुरुते । अथो
पञ्चविंशं वा एतद्दहः पञ्चविंश एतस्याह स्तोमस्तत्तमेन समं
प्रतिपद्यते तस्माद्दे एव पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति । इत्यध्यात्मं पञ्चविंशः ।
अथाधिदेवतम् । चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनो वाक्प्राणः ता एताः पञ्च
देवता इमं विष्टाः^१ पुरुषः^२ पञ्चो ह्येवैता^३ देवता अयं विष्टः
पुरुषः । सोऽंघालोमभ्य आनखेभ्यः सर्वः साङ्ग^४ आप्यते
तस्मात्सर्वाणि भूतान्यामिपीलिकाभ्य आप्रान्येव जायन्ते । तदु-
क्तमृषिणा । सहस्रधा पञ्चदशान्युक्थेति पञ्च हि दशती भवन्ति ।
यावद्यावापृथिवी तावदित्तदिति यावती वै द्यावापृथिवी ता-

^३ Numbered 15 in A, E, K, L, 15, 7 in F, G; 7 in D. E has 5 in text and 7 and 5 in commentary.

^१ विविष्टाः E.

^२ पुरुषो K.

^३ हेवे K.

^४ सोऽं A; सोऽं E.

^५ सर्वसाङ्ग K.

वानात्मा । सहस्रधा महिमानः सहस्रमित्युक्त्यान्वेव तदनुमदति
महयति । यावद्ब्रह्म विधितं जावती वागिति यत्र ह कृ च
ब्रह्म तद्वाग्यव वा वाक्कदा ब्रह्मेत्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति । एषां वा
एषां सूक्तानां नवर्चं प्रथमं नव वै प्राणाः प्राणानां कृष्यै ।
षष्ठ्यं⁶ भवति षड्वा ऋतव ऋतूनामांशैः । पञ्चर्चं भवति⁷
पञ्चपदा पङ्क्तिः पङ्क्तिर्वा अक्षमन्नाद्यस्यावरुद्धैः । तृचो भवति
त्रयो वा इमे त्रिवृतो लोका एषामेव लोकानामभिजित्यै । ता
अभिसंपद्यन्ते बृहतीं छन्दोऽमृतं देवलोकमेष⁸ आत्मा । एवमुहै-
वैवं¹⁰ विदेतयैव संपदामृतमेवात्मानमभिसंभवति संभवति ॥८॥¹¹

॥ इत्यैतरेयप्रथमारण्यके तृतीयोऽध्यायः ॥¹²

ADHYAYA 4.

अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि
संदधाति । अथातो यीवाः । ता आचक्षते यथाछन्दसमुष्णिह
इति । अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि
संदधाति । अथातः शिरः । तन्नायचीषु भवत्ययं वै छन्दसां
गायत्र्ययमङ्गानां¹ शिरः । तदर्कवतीषु भवत्यग्निर्वा अर्कः । ता

⁶ षष्ठ्यं R in text; षड्यं A, G; पञ्च्यं F; text, D, E, K, L.

⁷ ऋतूनाम्

R in text; ऋतून् A.

⁸ om. ॥ in text. It is in R in commentary and in

all the MSS. and in B.

⁹ मेव K.

¹⁰ हुवेव K.

¹¹ Numbered

16 in A, E, F, K, L; 16, 8 in G; no number in D. R in text has 6, in com-
mentary 16.

¹² इत्यैतरेयप्रथमारण्यके तृतीयोऽध्यायः A; इति प्रथम आरण्ये
(प्रथमारण्यके L) तृतीयोऽध्यायः K, L; तृतीयोऽध्यायः D, F, G; nothing in E, or
by an error in B in text.

¹ छन्दसांगानाम् omitting the rest, F.

नव भवन्ति नवकपालं वै शिरः । दशमीं शंसति त्वक्केशा^२
 इत्येव सा भवति । अथो स्तोमातिशंसनाया एव । तौ त्रिवृच्च
 स्तोमो^३ भवतो गायत्रं च छन्द एतयोर्वै स्तोमछन्दसोः प्रजा-
 तिमनु सर्वमिदं प्रजायते यदिदं किञ्च प्रजात्यै । प्रजायते^४
 प्रजया पशुभिर्य एवं वेद । अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो^५ वै
 सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वणि संदधाति । अथातो विजवः । ता
 विराजो भवन्ति तस्मात्पुरुषः पुरुषमाह वि^६ वा अस्मासु
 राजसि यीवा वै धारयसीति स्तभमानं वा यद्वा दुताः सद्वा-
 ळ्हतमाः^७ सत्योऽन्नतमां प्रत्यप्यन्तेऽन्नं हि विराळन्नमु^८
 वीर्यम् । अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वणि
 संदधाति ॥१॥^{१०}

अथातो दक्षिणः पक्षः । सोऽयं लोकः सोऽयमग्निः सा
 वाक्तद्रयन्तरं स वसिष्ठस्तच्छतं तानि षड्वीर्याणि भवन्ति ।
 संपात एव कामानामभ्यासै प्रतिष्ठित्या अन्नाद्याय षड्भिः ।
 अथ^१ सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वणि संद-
 धाति^२ । अथात उत्तरः पक्षः । सोऽसौ लोकः सोऽसावादित्य-
 स्तत्मनस्तदृहास भरद्वाजस्तच्छतं तानि षड्वीर्याणि भवन्ति । संपात
 एव कामानामभ्यासै प्रतिष्ठित्या अन्नाद्याय षड्भिः । ता ऊना-

^२ केश R in text^३ स्तोमो R in text ||^४ om F^५ प्राणो

न पर्वणि omitting the rest F, G

^६ Accented in E^७ सम्बृहत्तमाः R,

सम्बृहत्तमाः A, ळ्हेतमाः E, text, D, F, G, K, L, ||

^८ विराड् A R^९ उप K^{१०} Numbered १७ in A, E, K, L, १७, १ in F, G १ in D^१ अथ — संदधाति om in S though the commentary has it

तिरिक्तौ भवतो वृषा वै बृहद्योषा रथन्तरमतिरिक्तं वै पुंसो न्यूनः^१
 स्त्रियै तस्मादूनातिरिक्तौ भवतः । अथो एकेन ह वै पञ्चेण
 सुपर्णस्योत्तरः^२ पक्षो ज्यायांस्तस्मादेकयर्चोत्तरः पक्षो भूयान्भ-
 वति । अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि
 संदधाति । अथातः पुच्छम्^३ । ता एकविंशतिर्द्विपदा^४ भवन्त्ये-
 कविंशतिर्हीमानि प्रत्यञ्चि सुपर्णस्य पञ्चाणि भवन्ति । अथो
 एकविंशो वै स्तोमानां प्रतिष्ठा प्रतिष्ठा पुच्छं वयसाम् । द्वाविंशी^५
 शंसति प्रतिष्ठयोरेव तद्रूपं क्रियते तस्मात्सर्वाणि वयांसि पुच्छेन
 प्रतितिष्ठन्ति पुच्छेनैव प्रतिष्ठायोत्पत्तन्ति प्रतिष्ठा हि पुच्छम् । स
 एष द्वाभ्यां दशिनीभ्यां विराड्भ्रामनयोर्द्वाविंशोर्द्विपदयोरयं
 पुरुषः प्रतिष्ठितः । तस्य यत्सुपर्णरूपं तदस्य कामानामभ्यासै ।
 अथ यत्पुरुषरूपं तदस्य श्रियै यशसेऽन्नाद्यायापचित्यै । अथ
 सूददोहाः । अथ धाय्या^६ । अथ सूददोहाः । वृषा वै सूददोहा
 योषा धाय्या तदुभयतः सूददोहसा धाय्यां परिशंसति तस्माद्भूयो
 रेतः सिक्तं सदेकतामेवापेति योषामेवाभ्यत आजाना^७ हि
 योषातः प्रजाना तस्मादेनामच शंसति ॥२॥^{१०}

गायत्रीं तृचाशीतिं शंसत्ययं वै लोको गायत्री तृचाशीति-
 र्यदेवास्मिँलोके यशो यन्मही यन्मिथुनं यदन्नाद्यं यापचितिस्त-
 दन्नवै तदाप्रवानि तद्वरुण्यै तन्मेऽसदिति । अथ सूददोहाः ।

^१ नूनं G.^२ *स्योत्तरतः R^१; सुपर्णःस्योत्तरः K.^४ पुच्छम् A.^३ द्विपदा — एकविंशतिरु om. F.^५ द्वाविंशीं A.^७ द्वाविंशोर् A.^६ अथ धाय्याय सूददोहाः bis F.^८ आजाना K.^{१०} Numbered 18 in

A, E, K, L; 18, 2 in F, G; 2 in D.

प्राणो वै सूदोहाः प्राणेनेमं^१ लोकं संतनोति । बार्हतीं नृचा-
शीतिं शंसत्यन्तरिक्षलोको वै बार्हती नृचाशीतिर्यदेवान्तरिक्ष-
लोके यशो यन्महो यन्मिथुनं यदन्नाद्यं यापचितिस्तदग्नवै
तदाप्रवानि तदवरुणघै तन्मेऽसदिति । अथ सूदोहाः । प्राणो
वै सूदोहाः प्राणेनान्तरिक्षलोकं संतनोति । औष्णिहीं नृचा-
शीतिं शंसत्यसौ वै लोको द्यौरौष्णिही नृचाशीतिर्यदेवामुष्णि-
क्षोके यशो यन्महो^२ यन्मिथुनं यदन्नाद्यं यापचितिः यदेवानां
देवं तदग्नवै तदाप्रवानि तदवरुणघै तन्मेऽसदिति । अथ सूद-
ोहाः । प्राणो वै सूदोहाः प्राणेनामुं लोकं संतनोति संत-
नोति ॥३॥^३

॥ इत्यितरेयप्रथमारण्यके चतुर्थोऽध्यायः ॥^४

ADHYAYA 5

वशं^१ शंसति वशे म इदं सर्वमसदिति । ता एकविंशतिर्भवं-
न्त्येकविंशतिर्हि ता अन्तरुदरे विकृतयः । अथो एकविंशो वै
स्तोमानां प्रतिष्ठा प्रतिष्ठोदरमन्नाद्यानाम् । ता विछन्दसो भवन्ति
विष्णुद्रमिव वा अन्तस्त्यमणीय इव च स्थवीय इव च । ताः
प्रणाव^२ छन्दस्कार यथोपपादं शंसति यथोपपादमिव वा
अन्तस्त्यं हृसीय इव च द्राघीय इव च । अथ सूदोहाः ।

^१ In this section the MSS of S appear to have been defective only A ^२ Numbered 19 in A E III L 19 3 in F G 3 in D ^३ यशो
A II इति प्रथम आरणी (प्रथमारण्यके L) चतुर्थोऽध्याय (इथ only L) h L
इति चतुर्थोऽध्याय D चतुर्थोऽध्याय F G no colophon III

^४ यथ D E L ^५ असाद L ^६ एकविंशतिर्भवन्ति om F G but
added by H sec man ^७ प्रणाव 1 E O

प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वणि संदधाति । तामचोत्सृजति
द्वादशकृतः शक्त्वा द्वादशविधा वा इमे प्राणाः सप्त शीर्षण्या
द्वौ स्तन्यौ त्रयोऽवाञ्चोऽत्र वै प्राणा आप्यन्तेऽत्र संस्क्रियन्ते
तस्मादेनामचोत्सृजति । इन्द्राग्री युवं^१ सु न इत्येन्द्राग्रा^२ ऊरु
उर्वधीवे^३ प्रतिष्ठे । ताः षट्पदा भवन्ति प्रतिष्ठाया एव द्विप्र-
तिष्ठो वै पुरुषश्चतुष्पादाः^४ पशवो यजमानमेव तद्विप्रतिष्ठं
चतुष्पात्सु पशुषु प्रतिष्ठापयति । द्वितीया सप्तपदा भवति तां
गायत्रीं चानुष्टुभं च^५ करोति ब्रह्म वै गायत्री वागनुष्टुप्ब्रह्मणैव
तद्वाचं संदधाति । त्रिष्टुभमन्ततः शंसति वीर्यं^६ वै त्रिष्टुर्ब्रह्मणैव
तत्प्रशूनपरिगच्छति तस्मात्प्रशवो वीर्यमनूपतिष्ठन्त ईर्यतां चैवा-
भ्युत्थानं च ॥ १ ॥^७

प्र वो महे मन्दमानायान्यस^१ इत्येन्द्रे निष्केवल्ये^२ निविदं^३
दधाति प्रत्यक्षाद्येव^४ तदात्मन्वीर्यं धत्ते । तास्त्रिष्टुच्चगतीषु
भवन्ति । तदाहुरथ कस्मान्त्रिष्टुच्चगतीषु निविदं दधातीति । न
ह वा एतस्याहू एकं छन्दो निविदं दाधार न बिब्याचेति
तस्मान्त्रिष्टुच्चगतीषु निविदं दधाति । तदेतदहस्त्रिनिवित्तं विद्या-
द्वयो निविद्वाल्खित्या^५ निविन्निविदेव निविदेवमेनत्त्रिनि-
वित्तं विद्यात् । अथ सूक्ते वने न वा यो न्यधायि चाकन्यो

^१ इन्द्राग्रा F, G. ^२ ऊर्वं R. ^३ चतुष्पादः F, G. ^४ om. G; चरोति L.

^५ वीर्यं A. ^६ Numbered 20 in A, B, F, K, L; 20, 1 in G; 1 in D.

^७ मन्दनां L. ^८ निष्केवल्ये F, G. ^९ निविदं A. ^{१०} प्रत्यक्षाद्येव A, G, K.

^{११} वालखिल्यान् G. ^{१२} मेव A; मन्तत् G; श्वेतत् B in commentary; मेव D, E.

जात एव प्रथमो मनस्वानिति तयोरस्त्वन्ने समस्य यदसन्म-
नीषा इत्यन्नाद्यस्यावरुद्धौ । अथावपनमेते अन्तरेणैन्द्रीणां दश-
तीनां चिष्टुञ्जगतीनां बृहतीसंपन्नानां यावतीरावपन्ते तावन्पू-
र्ध्वमायुषो वर्षाणि जीवन्त्येतेन हैवावपनेनायुराप्यते । प्रजां मे
पशवोऽर्जयन्ति⁷ त्वेव सजनीयमनुशंसति । तार्क्ष्यं शंसति
स्वस्वयनं वै तार्क्ष्यः स्वस्तितायै स्वस्वयनमेव तत्कुस्ते⁸ ।
एकपदां शंसत्येकपदे सर्वमसानीत्यथो सर्वा छन्दस्कृतिमाप्नुवा-
नीति । इन्द्रं विश्वा अवीवृधन्ति पदानुषङ्गास्ताः सप्तानुषजति
सप्त वै शीर्षप्राणाः शीर्षन्नेव⁹ तत्प्राणान्दधात्यष्टमीं नानुषजति
वागष्टमी नेन्ने वाक्प्राणैरनुषक्तासदिति तस्मादु सा वाक्समा-
नायतना प्राणैः सत्यननुषक्ता । विराजः शंसत्यन्नं वै विराजो
ऽन्नाद्यस्यावरुद्धौ । वासिष्ठेन परिदधाति वसिष्ठोऽसानीति । एष
स्तोमो मह उपाय वाह इति महद्यत्या रूपसमृद्धया । धुरी-
वात्यो न वाजयन्त्रधायीत्यन्तो वै धूरन्त एतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम् ।
इन्द्र त्वायसर्के ईद्रे वसूनामित्यर्कवत्या रूपसमृद्धया । दिवीव
द्यामधि नः श्रोमत्¹⁰ धा इति यत्र ह ऋ च¹¹ ब्रह्मण्या वागुद्यते
तद्वास्य¹² कीर्तिर्भवति यच्चैवं विद्वानेतया परिदधाति तस्मादेवं
विद्वानेतयैव परिदध्यात् ॥ २ ॥¹⁴

⁷ पशवोर्जयन् R in text

⁸ कुते F

⁹ शंसत्य R in text

¹⁰ शीर्षन्ने F, G, शीर्षन्ने L

¹¹ न D, E ओ R

¹² ऋ च om E

¹³ तद्वास्य R, तद्वासा G तद्वास्य F

¹⁴ Numbered 22 in A, E G, h L.

21 2 in F 2 in D

तत्सवितुर्वृणीमहेऽद्या नो देव सवितरिति वैश्वदेवस्य प्रति-
 पदनुचरावैकाहिकौ रूपसमृद्धौ बहु वा एतस्मिन्नहनि किञ्च
 किञ्च वारणं क्रियते शान्त्या एव शान्तिर्वै प्रतिष्ठैकाहः शान्त्यामेव
 तत्प्रतिष्ठायामन्ततः प्रतितिष्ठन्ति । प्रतितिष्ठति य एवं वेद येषां
 चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । तद्देवस्य सवितुर्वार्यं महदिति
 सावित्रमन्तो वै महदन्त एतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम् । कतरा पूर्वा
 कतरापरायोरिति द्यावापृथिवीयं समानोदर्कं समानोदर्कं वा
 एतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम् । अनश्वो जातो अनभीशुरुक्थ्य इत्यार्भ-
 वम् । रथस्त्रिचक्र इति यदेतच्चिवत्तदन्ती वै चिवदन्त एतद-
 हरेतस्याहो रूपम् । अस्य^१ वामस्य पलितस्य होतुरिति वैश्वदेवं
 बहुरूपं बहुरूपं वा एतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम् । गौरीर्मिमाय
 सलिलानि तक्षतीत्येतदन्तम् । आ नो भद्राः क्रतवो यन्तु
 विश्वत इति वैश्वदेवं निविद्वानमैकाहिकं रूपसमृद्धं बहु वा
 एतस्मिन्नहनि किञ्च किञ्च वारणं क्रियते शान्त्या एव शा-
 न्तिर्वै प्रतिष्ठैकाहः शान्त्यामेव तत्प्रतिष्ठायामन्ततः प्रतितिष्ठन्ति ।
 प्रतितिष्ठति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति ।
 वैश्वानराय धिषणामृतावृध इत्याग्निमारुतस्य प्रतिपदन्तो वै
 धिषणान्त एतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम् । प्रयज्यवो मरुतो भ्राजदृष्टय
 इति मारुतं समानोदर्कं समानोदर्कं वा एतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम् ।
 जातवेदसे सुनवाम सोममिति जातवेदस्यां पुरस्तात्सूक्तस्य शंसति
 स्वस्त्ययनं वै जातवेदस्या^२ स्वस्तितायै स्वस्त्ययनमेव तत्कुरुते ।

^१ पदे S.^२ एतस्यावमस्य omitting the rest, F.^३ धिषण् A.^४ जातवेदस्याः B in text.

इमं स्तोममर्हते जातवेदस इति जातवेदस्यं समानोदकं समानो-
दकं वा एतदहरेतस्याहो रूपमहो रूपम् ॥३॥^१

॥ इत्यैतरेयप्रथमारण्यके पञ्चमोऽध्यायः ॥^२

॥ इति प्रथमारण्यकं समाप्तम् ॥

^१ Numbered 22 in A, E, K, L., 22, 3 in F, G. ^२ Text, A and, omitting the second इति, L. पञ्चमोऽध्यायः ५ । इति प्रथमारण्यकं समाप्तम् । F, G; इति पञ्चमोऽध्यायः प्रथमारण्यः D. इति प्रथम आरण्यके पञ्चमोऽध्यायः ५ K. E continues after the number एष पञ्चा सप्तमम् । तत्सविर्गुर्वृणीमहेऽद्या ऋ द्वे सवितरिति । प्र ऋ महे मन्मनायायस इति । अथ श्रवति । गायत्री तुषाघीति श्रवति । अघातो दक्षिणः पयः । अथ मूददोहाः । ता नदिन विहरति प्रायो वै नदः । तदिदास भुवनेषु ऋषिमिति प्रतिपद्यते यद्वि ऋषम् । तदिति प्रतिपद्यते । तर्दाङ्गः कितस्त्राङ्गः प्रतिपद्यति । द्विकारेणैतदहं प्रतिपद्येति त्वाङ्गः । अरन्विमाथ उपरि भूमेः मेहु स्वादित्वाङ्गः । तदाङ्गः किं मेहुस्व • मेहुत्वमिति । असत्सु मे जरितस्त्राभिपेगस्त-
त्यधुतमिति श्रवति । आ स्वा रथ यघीतय इदं वसो मुतमन्थ इति ^३ । वाथवा याहि द्यतिमे • सोमा अरक्षता इति • । गायत्र प्रथमं कुर्यादित्वाङ्गः । अग्नि नरो दीधितिनि-
ररथोरित्यन्नायकाम् । अथ महाव्रतम् । अथ महाव्रतं चत्वारि । आ स्वा रथ चत्वारि । द्विकारेणाष्टौ । अथ मूददोहास्त्रयः । वज्रस्त्रयः । अथ महाव्रतं तदिति प्र ऋ महे धौ । इति • प्रथमारण्यम् । This appears also in F and E with the variants noted below but not in the other MSS. It forms of course, a sort of Anukraman of the contents and E has similar notices at the end of each Aranyaka

^३ Before this, F, G have ता नदिन विहरति प्रायो वै नदः । तदिदास भुवनेषु ऋषिमिति प्रतिपद्यते एतदाथ भुवनेषु ऋषि । तदिति प्रतिपद्यते । These three were obviously omitted accidentally through the identity of three and six

तदहं F, G ° om F. ° इदं—इति om F, G ° इमे—इति om F, G

^४ अथ G. वास्त्रयः om F ° om F, G

॥ अथ द्वितीयारण्यकम् ॥

ADHYĀVA 1.

एष षण्था एतत्कर्मैतद्वृत्तैतत्सत्यम् । तस्मान्न प्रमाद्येत्तन्ना-
 तीयात् । न ह्यत्यायन्पूर्वं येऽत्यायंस्ते परावभूवुः । तदुक्तमृषिणा ।
 प्रजा ह तिस्रो अत्यायमीयुर्न्यया अर्कमभितो विविधे । बृहद्
 तस्थौ भुवनेष्वन्तः पवमानो हरित आ विवेशेति ॥ प्रजा ह
 तिस्रो^१ अत्यायमीयुरिति या वै ता इमाः प्रजास्तिस्रो^२ अत्याय-
 मायंस्तानीमानि वयांसि वङ्गावगधाश्वेरपादाः । न्यया अर्कम-
 भितो विविध इति ता इमाः प्रजा अर्कमभितो निविष्टा
 इममेवाग्निम् । बृहद् तस्थौ भुवनेष्वन्तरित्यद उ एव बृहद्भुवने-
 ष्वन्तरसावादित्यः । पवमानो हरित आ विवेशेति वायुरेव
 पवमानो दिशो^३ हरित आविष्टः^४ ॥ १ ॥

उक्त्यमुक्त्यमिति वै प्रजा वदन्ति तदिदमेवोक्त्यमित्यमेव
 पृथिवीतो हीदं सर्वमुत्तिष्ठति यदिदं किञ्च । तस्याग्निरर्कोऽक्षम-
 शीतयोऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्नुते । अन्तरिक्षमेवोक्त्यमन्तरिक्षं वा
 अनु पतन्त्यन्तरिक्षमनु धावयन्ति तस्य वायुरर्कोऽक्षमशीतयो
 ऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्नुते । असावेव द्यौस्त्वयममुतः प्रदानाद्हीदं
 सर्वमुत्तिष्ठति यदिदं किञ्च तस्यासावादित्योऽर्कोऽक्षमशीतयो

^१ तिस्रः here and below II in text, but the words are clearly quoted in their
 Rigvedic forms ^२ अथर् A ^३ दिशे II in text ^४ आविष्टाः F

ऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्रुते । इत्यधिदैवतम् । अथाध्यात्मम् । पुरुष एवोक्थमयमेव महान्प्रजापतिरहमुक्थमस्मीति विद्यात् । तस्य मुखमेवोक्थं यथा पृथिवी तथा । तस्य वागर्कोऽन्नमशीतयोऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्रुते । नासिके एवोक्थं यथान्तरिक्षं तथा । तस्य प्राणोऽर्कोऽन्नमशीतयोऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्रुते । तदेतद्ब्रह्मस्य^१ विष्टपं यदेतन्नासिकायै विनतमिव । ललाटमेवोक्थं यथा द्यौस्तथा । तस्य चक्षुरर्कोऽन्नमशीतयोऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्रुते । समानमशीतयोऽध्यात्मं चाधिदैवतं चान्नमेवाच्चेन हीमानि सर्वाणि भूतानि समनन्ती^२३ अन्नेनेमं लोकं जयत्यन्नेनामुं तस्मात्समानमशीतयोऽध्यात्मं चाधिदैवतं चान्नमेव । तदिदमन्नमन्नादमियमेव पृथिवीतो हीदं सर्वमुत्तिष्ठति यदिदं किञ्च । यद्ध किञ्चेदं प्रेती^३३ तदसौ सर्वमस्ति यदु किञ्चातः प्रेती^३३ तदियं सर्वमस्ति सेयमित्याद्यान्ती । अन्ता ह वा आद्यो भवति । न तस्येशे यन्नाद्याद्यदैनं नाद्युः ॥२॥

अथातो रेतसः सृष्टिः । प्रजापते रेतो देवा देवानां रेतो वर्धं वर्धस्य रेत ओपधय ओपधीनां रेतोऽन्नमन्नस्य रेतो रेतो रेतसो रेतः प्रजाः प्रजानां रेतो हृदयं हृदयस्य रेतो मनो मनसो रेतो वाग्वाचो रेतः कर्म तदिदं कर्म कृतमयं पुरुषो ब्रह्मणो लोकः । स इरामयो यदीरामयस्तस्माद्विरणमयः । हिरणमयो ह वा अमुष्मिँल्लोके संभवति हिरणमयः सर्वेभ्यो भूतेभ्यो ददृशे य एवं वेद ॥३॥

^१ ब्रह्मण G^२ यजत्व० G^३ वसंछत० ॥

तं प्रपदाभ्यां प्रापद्यत¹ ब्रह्मेमं पुरुषं यत्प्रपदाभ्यां प्रापद्यत
 ब्रह्मेमं पुरुषं तस्मात्प्रपदे तस्मात्प्रपदे इत्याचक्षते शफाः खुरा
 इत्यन्येषां पशूनाम् । तदूर्ध्वमुदसर्पत्ता ऊरू अभवताम् । उरु
 गृणीहीत्यब्रवीत्तदुदरमभवत् । उर्वेव मे कुर्वित्यब्रवीत्तदुरोऽभवत् ।
 उदरं ब्रह्मेति शार्कराष्ट्या² उपासते हृदयं ब्रह्मेत्यारुणयो ब्रह्मा-
 हैव ताऽइ । ऊर्ध्वं त्वेवोदसर्पत्तच्छिरोऽश्रयत यच्छिरोऽश्रयत
 तच्छिरोऽभवत्तच्छिरसः शिरस्त्वम् । ता एताः शीर्षज्जिह्वयः
 श्रिताश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनो वाक्प्राणः । अयन्तेऽस्मिज्जिह्वो य
 एवमेतच्छिरसः शिरस्त्वं वेद । ता अहिंसन्ताहमुक्थमस्यहमु-
 क्थमस्मीति । ता अब्रुवन्हन्तास्माच्छरीरादुत्क्रामाम तद्यस्मिन्न
 उत्क्रान्त इदं शरीरं पतस्यति तदुक्थं भविष्यतीति । वागुदक्रा-
 मदवदन्नग्ननिवन्नास्त्वैव । चक्षुरुदक्रामदपश्यन्नग्ननिवन्नास्त्वैव ।
 श्रोत्रमुदक्रामदशृण्वन्नग्ननिवन्नास्त्वैव । मन उदक्रामन्मीलित
 इवाग्ननिवन्नास्त्वैव । प्राण उदक्रामत्तत्प्राण उत्क्रान्तेऽपद्यत ।
 तर्दशीर्यताशरीती³ तच्छरीरमभवत्तच्छरीरस्य शरीरत्वम् ।
 शीर्यते ह वा अस्य द्विषन्पाप्मा भ्रातृव्यः परास्य द्विषन्पाप्मा
 भ्रातृव्यो भवति य एवं वेद । ता अहिंसन्तैवाहमुक्थमस्यहमु-
 क्थमस्मीति । ता अब्रुवन्हन्तेदं पुनः शरीरं प्रविशाम तद्यस्मिन्नः
 प्रपन्न इदं शरीरमुत्थास्यति तदुक्थं भविष्यतीति । वाक्प्राविश-
 दशयदेव । चक्षुः प्राविशदशयदेव । श्रोत्रं⁴ प्राविशदशयदेव ।

¹ मापद्यतं G² शर्करा G³ ब्रह्मा हैव R, cp p 68, J R A. S., 1908,

p 366

⁴ यत् G, तं om K.⁵ उत्क्रान्ते R in text.⁶ तशी° E⁷ This clause is omitted in G.

मनः प्राविशदश्यदेव । प्राणः प्राविशत्तत्प्राणे प्रपन्न उदतिष्ठ-
त्तदुक्तमभवत् । तदेतदुक्त्याँ३ प्राण एव । प्राण उक्त्यमित्येव
विद्यात् । तं देवा अद्भुवंस्त्वमुक्त्यमसि त्वमिदं सर्वमसि तव वयं
स्मस्त्वमस्माकमसीति । तदप्येतदृषिणोक्तम् । त्वमस्माकं तव
स्ससीति ॥४॥

• तं देवाः प्राणयन्त ॥ प्रणीतः प्रातायत प्रातायीतीँ३
तत्प्रातरभवत्समागादितीँ३ तत्सायमभवदहरेव प्राणो रात्रिर-
पानः । वागग्निश्चक्षुरसावादित्यश्चन्द्रमा मनो दिशः श्रोत्रं स एष
प्रहितां संयोगोऽध्यात्ममिमा देवता अद उ आविरधिदैवत-
मित्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति । एतच्च स्म वै तद्विद्वानाह हिरण्यदन्वैदो
न तस्येशे यन्मह्यं न दद्युरिति प्रहितां वा अहमध्यात्मं संयोगं
निविष्टं वेदैतच्च तत् । अनीशनानि ह वा अस्मै भूतानि बलिं
हरन्ति य एवं वेद । तत्सत्यं सदिति प्राणस्तीत्यन्वँ१ यमित्यसा-
वादित्यस्तदेतत्त्रिवृत्त्रिवृदिव वै चक्षुः शुक्लं कृष्णं क्लीनिकेति ।
स यदि ह वा अपि मृषा वदति सत्यं हैवास्योदितं भवति य
एवमेतत्सत्यस्य सत्यत्वं वेद ॥५॥

तस्य वाक्कन्तिर्नामानि दामानि१ तदस्येदं वाचा तन्या
नामभिर्दामभिः सर्वे सितं सर्वे हीदं नामनीँ३ सर्वे वाचाभि-

१ तत्तथं A; उक्त्यं E, F, उक्त्यं३ G.

२ यं H, E, with the MSS. See explanatory note.

३ तीत्यत्रयम् G.

तीत्यत्रयम् D, E

३ मम् K

१ दमानि G

वदति । वहन्ति ह वा एनं तनिसंबद्धा य एवं वेद । तस्यो-
 ष्णिग्लोमानि त्वगायत्री^२ विष्टुर्मांसमनुष्टुप्तावान्यस्थि जगती
 पङ्क्तिर्मज्जा प्राणो बृहती स छन्दोभिश्छन्दो^३ यच्छन्दोभिश्छन्दस्त-
 स्माच्छन्दांसीत्याचक्षते । छादयन्ति ह वा एनं छन्दांसि प्रापा-
 त्कर्मणो यस्यां कस्याञ्चिद्दिशि कामयते य एवमेतच्छन्दां-
 छन्दस्त्वं वेद । तदुक्तमृषिणा । अपश्यं गोषामित्येष वै गोप्ता
 एष हीदं सर्वं गोपायति । अनिपद्यमानमिति न ह्येष कदा-
 चन संविशति । आ च परा च पृथिभिश्चरन्तमित्या च ह्येष
 परा च पृथिभिश्चरति । स सध्रीचीः स विषूचीर्वसान इति
 सध्रीचीश्च ह्येष विषूचीश्च वस्त इमा एव दिशः । आ वरीवर्त्तिं
 भुवनेष्वन्तरित्येष ह्यन्तर्भुवनेष्व्वावरीवर्त्तिं । अथो आवृतासो
 ऽवतासो न कर्तुमिरिति । सर्वं हीदं प्राणेनावृतम् । सोऽयमा-
 काशः प्राणेन बृहत्या विष्टब्धस्तद्यथायमाकाशः प्राणेन बृहत्या
 विष्टब्ध^४ एवं सर्वाणि भूतान्यापिपीलिकाभ्यः प्राणेन बृहत्या
 विष्टब्धानीत्येवं^५ विद्यात् ॥६॥

अथातो विभूतयोऽस्य पुरुषस्य । तस्य वाचा सृष्टौ पृथिवी
 चाग्निश्चास्यामोषधयो जायन्तेऽग्निरेनाः स्वदयतीदमाहरतेर्दमा-
 हरतेत्येवमेतौ वाचं पितरं परिचरतः पृथिवी चाग्निश्च । यावदनु
 पृथिवी यावदन्वग्निस्तावानस्य लोको भवन्ति नास्य तावत्लोको
 जीर्यते यावदेतयोर्न जीर्यते पृथिव्याश्चाग्नेश्च य एवमेतां वाचो

^२ गायत्रीष्टुम् F. ^३ छन्दो A. ^४ प्राणो न B in text. ^५ छन्द A. ^६ ष्व B.

^१ एदमाहरते loc F, G.

^२ यावदनु पृथिवी loc F.

विभूतिं वेद । प्राणेन सृष्टावन्तरिक्षं च वायुश्चान्तरिक्षं वा अनु
 चरन्त्यन्तरिक्षमनु शृण्वन्ति वायुरस्मै पुण्यं गन्धमावहत्येवमेतौ
 प्राणं पितरं परिचरतोऽन्तरिक्षं च वायुश्च । यावदन्वन्तरिक्षं
 यावदनु वायुस्तावानस्य लोको भवति नास्य तावल्लोको
 जीर्यते यावदेतयोर्न जीर्यते^१ऽन्तरिक्षस्य च वायोश्च य एवमेतां
 प्राणस्य विभूतिं वेद । चक्षुषा सृष्टौ द्यौश्चादित्यश्च द्यौर्हास्मै
 वृष्टिमन्नाद्यं संप्रयच्छत्यादित्योऽस्य ज्योतिः प्रकाशं करोत्येवमेतौ
 चक्षुः पितरं परिचरतो द्यौश्चादित्यश्च । यावदनु द्यौर्यावदन्वा-
 दित्यस्तावानस्य लोको भवति^२ नास्य तावल्लोको जीर्यते याव-
 देतयोर्न जीर्यते दिवश्चादित्यस्य च य एवमेतां चक्षुषो विभूतिं
 वेद । श्रोत्रेण सृष्टा दिशश्च चन्द्रमाश्च दिग्भ्यो हैनमार्यन्ती^३ ३
 दिग्भ्यो विष्णुणोति चन्द्रमा अस्मै पूर्वपक्षापरपक्षान्विचिनोति
 पुण्याय कर्मण एवमेते श्रोत्रं पितरं परिचरन्ति दिशश्च चन्द्र-
 माश्च । यावदनु दिशो यावदनु चन्द्रमास्तावानस्य लोको भवति
 नास्य तावल्लोको जीर्यते यावदेतेषां न जीर्यते दिशां च चन्द्रम-
 सश्च य^४ एवमेतां श्रोत्रस्य विभूतिं वेद । मनसा सृष्टा आपश्च^५
 वरुणश्चापो हास्मै अद्वा संनमन्ते पुण्याय कर्मणे वरुणोऽस्य
 प्रजां धर्मेण दाधौरैवमेते मनः पितरं परिचरन्त्यापश्च वरुणश्च ।
 यावदन्वापो यावदनु वरुणस्तावानस्य लोको भवति नास्य
 तावल्लोको जीर्यते यावदेतेषां न जीर्यतेऽेषां च वरुणस्य च य
 एवमेतां मनसो विभूतिं वेद ॥७॥

^१ क्षन्ति ६^२ भवति लोको om. ६^३ अती ३ ६^४ य — आपश्च om. F, G.

[आपा३ इत्याप^१ इति तदिदमाप एवेदं वै मूलमदस्तूलमयं
 पितृते पुत्रा यत्र ह क्व च पुत्रस्य तत्पितुर्यत्र वा पितुस्तद्वा
 पुत्रस्येत्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति । एतद्ध स वै तद्विद्वानाह महिदास
 ऐतरेय आह^२ मां देवेभ्यो वेदः श्रो महेवान्वेदेतः प्रदाना ह्येत इतः
 संभृता इति] [स एष गिरिश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनो वाक्प्राणस्तं ब्रह्म-
 गिरिरित्याचक्षते । गिरिति^३ ह वै द्विषन्तं पाप्मानं भ्रातृव्यं
 परास्य द्विषन्पाप्मा भ्रातृव्यो भवति य एवं वेद । स एषोऽसुः
 स^४ एष प्राणः स एष भूतिश्चाभूतिश्च] तं भूतिरिति देवा
 उपासाञ्चक्रे ते बभूवुस्तस्माद्वाप्येतर्हि सुप्तो भूर्भूतित्वेव प्रश्व-
 सिति । अभूतिरित्यसुरास्ते ह परावभूवुः । भवत्यात्मना परास्य
 द्विषन्पाप्मा भ्रातृव्यो भवति य एवं वेद । स एष मृत्युश्चैवामृतं
 ४ च [तदुक्तमृषिणा । अपाङ्गाडेति स्वधया गृभीत इत्यपानेन
 ह्ययं यतः प्राणो^५ न पराङ्गवति । अमर्त्यो^६ मर्त्येना^७ सयोनि-
 रित्येतेन हीदं सर्वं सयोनि मर्त्यानि हीमानि शरीराणी^८
 अमृतैषा देवता । ता शश्वन्ता विषूचीना वियन्ता न्यन्यं चि-
 क्युर्न नि चिक्युरन्यमिति निचिन्वन्ति हैवेमानि शरीराणी^९
 अमृतैर्विषा देवता] अमृतो ह वा अमुष्मिँल्लोके संभवत्यमृतः
 सर्वेभ्यो भूतेभ्यो दृश्ये य एवं वेद य एवं वेद ॥८॥

॥ इत्यैतरेयद्वितीयारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥^१

^१ अप A; at the beginning आपा३: R.

^२ आह E.

^३ गिरिति D, G.

^४ स एष प्राणः om. F.

^५ प्राणेन F.

^६ मर्त्येना D.

^७ चिक्युर् G.

omitting चि.

^८ Text, D, R, इति ऐतरेयारण्यके द्वितीयस्य प्रथमोऽध्यायः A.

ADHYĀYA 2.

एष इमं लोकमभ्यार्चन्पुरुषरूपेण य एष तपति प्राणो वाव^१ तदभ्यार्चन्प्राणो ह्येष य एष तपति । तं शतं वर्षाण्यभ्यार्चन्तस्माच्छतं वर्षाणि पुरुषायुषो भवन्ति तं यच्छतं वर्षाण्यभ्यार्चन्तस्माच्छतर्चिनस्तस्माच्छतर्चिन इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । स इदं सर्वं मध्यतो दधे यदिदं किञ्च स यदिदं सर्वं मध्यतो दधे यदिदं किञ्च तस्मान्माध्यमास्तस्मान्माध्यमा^२ इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । प्राणो वै गृत्सोऽपानो मदः स यत्प्राणो^३ गृत्सोऽपानो मदस्तस्माद्गृत्समदस्तस्माद्गृत्समद इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । तस्येदं विश्वं मित्रमासीद्यदिदं किञ्च तद्यदस्येदं विश्वं मित्रमासीद्यदिदं किञ्च^४ तस्माद्विश्वमित्रस्तस्माद्विश्वमित्र इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । तं देवा अब्रुवन्नयं वै नः सर्वेषां वाम इति तं यद्देवा अब्रुवन्नयं वै नः सर्वेषां वाम इति तस्माद्वामदेवस्तस्माद्वामदेव इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । स इदं सर्वं पाप्मनोऽचायत यदिदं किञ्च स यदिदं सर्वं पाप्मनोऽचायत यदिदं किञ्च तस्मादचयस्तस्मादचय इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् ॥१॥^५

इति द्वितीय आरण्ये प्रथमोऽध्यायः K, द्वितीयाख्ये प्रथमोऽध्यायः १ F, G, प्रथमोऽध्यायः D .

^१ वावदु F ^२ तस्मान्माध्यमास् om. F, मध्यमास् E ^३ मध्यमा E,
as in Bṛhaddevata III, 216 ^४ प्राणि वै F, प्राणो वै गृत्सो वै गृत्सो G

^५ असीद् E ^६ तद् — किञ्च om. F. ^७ तस्माद्वामदेवस् om. F

^८ Numbered १ in A, E, F, G, H, K, L, 2 in D

एष उ एव विभ्रद्वाजः प्रजा वै वाजस्ता¹ एष विभर्ति यद्वि-
 भर्ति तस्माद्भ्रद्वाजस्तस्माद्भ्रद्वाज इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् ।
 तं देवा अब्रुवन्नयं वै नः सर्वेषां वसिष्ठ इति तं यदेवा अब्रु-
 वन्नयं वै नः सर्वेषां वसिष्ठ इति तस्माद्वसिष्ठस्तस्माद्वसिष्ठ
 इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । स इदं सर्वमभिप्रागाद्यदिदं किञ्च
 स यदिदं सर्वमभिप्रागाद्यदिदं किञ्च तस्मात्प्रगाथास्तस्मात्प्र-
 गाथा² इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । स इदं सर्वमभ्यपवयत
 यदिदं किञ्च स यदिदं सर्वमभ्यपवयत यदिदं किञ्च तस्मात्पा-
 वमान्यस्तस्मात्पावमान्य इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । सोऽब्रवी-
 दहमिदं सर्वमसानि यच्च क्षुद्रं यच्च महदिति ते क्षुद्रसूक्ताश्चाभव-
 न्महासूक्ताश्च तस्मात्क्षुद्रसूक्तास्तस्मात्क्षुद्रसूक्ता इत्याचक्षत एतमेव
 सन्तम् । सूक्तं वतावोचतेति तत्सूक्तमभवत्तस्मात्सूक्तं तस्मात्सूक्त-
 मित्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । एष वा ऋगेष ह्येभ्यः सुर्वेभ्यो
 भूतेभ्योऽर्चत स यदेभ्यः सर्वेभ्यो भूतेभ्योऽर्चत तस्मादृक्तस्मादृ-
 गित्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । एष वा अर्धर्च एष ह्येभ्यः
 सर्वेभ्योऽर्धेभ्योऽर्चत स यदेभ्यः सर्वेभ्योऽर्धेभ्योऽर्चत तस्मा-
 दर्धर्चस्तस्मादर्धर्च इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । एष वै षट्मेष
 हीमानि सर्वाणि भूतानि पादि स यदिमानि सर्वाणि भूतानि
 पादि तस्मात्षट् तस्मात्षट्मित्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । एष
 वा अक्षरमेष ह्येभ्यः सर्वेभ्यो भूतेभ्यः क्षरति न चैनमतिक्षरन्ति

¹ तं R in text.² प्रागाथाः A, D, E, K.³ प्रागाथाः D, E, Kpr. man. Both *Āśvinaṅgama Gṛhya Sūtra*, III, 4, 3, and *Sākhyaṅgama Gṛhya Sūtra*, IV, 10, 3, have प्र°.

स यदेभ्यः सर्वेभ्यो भूतेभ्यः क्षरति न चैनमतिक्षरन्ति तस्मा-
दक्षरं तस्मादक्षरमित्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । ता वा एताः
सर्वा ऋचः सर्वे वेदाः सर्वे घोषा एकैव व्याहृतिः प्राण एव
प्राण ऋच इत्येव विद्यात् ॥२॥^१

विश्वामित्रं ह्येतदहः शंसिष्यन्तमिन्द्र उपनिषसाद^१ । स हान्न-
मित्यभिव्याहृत्य बृहतीसहस्रं शशंस तेनेन्द्रस्य प्रियं धामोपेयाय ।
तमिन्द्र उवाच ऋषे प्रियं वै मे धामोपागाः स वा ऋषे
द्वितीयं शंसेति । स हान्नमित्येवाभिव्याहृत्य बृहतीसहस्रं^२ शशंस
तेनेन्द्रस्य प्रियं धामोपेयाय । तमिन्द्र उवाच ऋषे प्रियं वै मे
धामोपागाः स वा ऋषे तृतीयं शंसेति । स हान्नमित्येवाभिव्या-
हृत्य बृहतीसहस्रं शशंस तेनेन्द्रस्य प्रियं धामोपेयाय । तमिन्द्र
उवाच ऋषे प्रियं वै मे धामोपागा वरं ते ददामीति । स
होवाच त्वामेव जानीयामिति । तमिन्द्र उवाच प्राणो वा
अहमस्म्यृषे प्राणस्त्वं प्राणः सर्वाणि भूतानि प्राणो ह्येष य एष
तपति स एतेन^३ रूपेण सर्वा दिशो विशोऽस्मि तस्य मेऽन्नं
मित्रं दक्षिणं तद्विश्वामित्रमेव तपन्नेवास्मीति होवाच ॥३॥^४

तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तस्य यानि व्यञ्जनानि तच्छ-
रीरं यो घोषः स आत्मा य ऊष्माणः स प्राणः । एतच्च स्म

^१ Numbered 10 in A, E, F, G, H, K, L; 2 in D.

^२ उपनिषसाद MSF B, S

^३ बृहतीसहस्रं E

^४ एषे F

^५ तद्विद्यामित्रम् D

^६ Numbered 11 in A, E, G, H, K, L, 1 in F, 3 in D

वै तद्विद्वान्वसिष्ठो वसिष्ठो बभूव तत एतन्नामधेयं लेभे । एतदु
 हैवेन्द्रो विष्णामिनाय प्रोवाचैतदु हैवेन्द्रो भरद्वाजाय प्रोवाच
 तस्मात्स तेन बन्धुना यज्ञेषु हूयते । तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं
 तस्य वा एतस्य बृहतीसहस्रस्य संपन्नस्य षट्त्रिंशत्तमक्षराणां
 सहस्राणि भवन्ति तावन्ति शतसंवत्सरस्याहं सहस्राणि भवन्ति
 व्यञ्जनैरेव राक्षीराण्युवन्ति स्वरैरहानि । तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं
 संपन्नं तस्य वा एतस्य बृहतीसहस्रस्य संपन्नस्य परस्तात्प्र-
 ज्ञामयो देवतामयो ब्रह्ममयोऽमृतमयः संभूय देवता अप्येति यः
 एवं वेद । तद्योऽहं सोऽसौ योऽसौ सोऽहम् । तदुक्तमृषिणा ।
सूर्य आत्मा जगतस्तस्युपस्थेति^१ । एतदु हैवोपेक्षेतीपेक्षेत ॥ ४ ॥^२

॥ इत्येतरैर्यद्वितीयारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥^३

ADHYĀYA 3.

यो ह वा आत्मानं पञ्चविधमुक्तं वेद यस्मादिदं सर्वमु-
 त्तिष्ठति स संप्रतिवित् । पृथिवी वायुराकाश आपो ज्योती-
 षीत्येष वा आत्मोक्तं पञ्चविधमेतस्माद्विदं सर्वमुत्तिष्ठत्येतमे-
 वाप्येति । अयनं ह वै समानानां भवति य एवं^४ वेद ।

^१ एनम् A ; एतं II in text, no doubt a mistake due to the MSS as often putting
 ए for an assimilated न before a nasal. Cf. II, 1, 5, यं for यन् ^२ य om. F.

^३ स G. ^४ Divided च । इति in R. ^५ Numbered 12 in A, E, H, K, L;
 12, 4 in F, G ; 4 in D.

^६ Text, A, L, R ; इति द्वितीय आरण्ये द्वितीयो
 अध्यायः २ K ; द्वितीयारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः २ F, G ; इति द्वितीयोऽध्यायः D ;
 no colophon E.

^७ एवं om. A.

तस्मिन्योऽन्नं चाच्चादं च वेदाहास्मिन्नच्चादो जायते भवत्यस्या-
न्नम् । आपश्च पृथिवी चान्नमेतन्मयानि ह्यन्नानि भवन्ति ज्योतिश्च
वायुश्चान्नादमेताभ्यां हीदं सर्वमन्नमर्त्यावपनमाकाश आकाशे
हीदं सर्वं समोष्यते । आवपनं ह वै समानानां भवति य एवं
वेद । तस्मिन्योऽन्नं चाच्चादं च वेदाहास्मिन्नच्चादो जायते भवत्य-
स्यान्नम् । ओषधिवनस्पतयोऽन्नं प्राणभृतोऽन्नादमोषधिवन-
स्पतीन् हि प्राणभृतोऽदन्ति । तेषां य उभयतोदन्ताः पुरुषस्यानु
विधां^१ विहितास्तेऽन्नादा अन्नमितरे पशवस्तस्मात् इतरान्पशू-
नधीव चरन्त्यधीव ह्यन्नेऽन्नादो भवति । अधीव ह समानानां
जायते य एवं वेद ॥१॥^२

तस्य य आत्मानमाविस्तरां वेदाश्रुते हाविर्भूयः । ओषधिवन-
स्पतयो यच्च किञ्च प्राणभृत् आत्मानमाविस्तरां वेद । ओषधि-
वनस्पतिषु हि रसो दृश्यते चित्तं प्राणभृत्सु । प्राणभृत्सु त्वेवावि-
स्तरामात्मा तेषु हि रसोऽपि दृश्यते न चित्तमितरेषु । पुरुषे
त्वेवाविस्तरामात्मा स हि प्रज्ञानेन संपन्नतमो विज्ञातं वदति
विज्ञातं पश्यति वेद श्वस्तनं वेद लोकालोकी सत्येनामृतसी-
प्तयेवं संपन्नः । अथेतरेषां पशूनामशनापिपासे एवाभिविज्ञानं
न विज्ञातं वदन्ति न विज्ञातं पश्यन्ति न विदुः श्वस्तनं न
लोकालोकी न एतावन्तो भवन्ति यथाप्रज्ञं^३ हि संभवाः ॥२॥^४

^१ ०त्यं R^२ अनुविधा S^३ इतरान् P.^४ Numbered 13 in

A, E, H, K, L, 13, 5 in F, G, 1 in D

^१ आपुत्सु S^२ प्रज्ञा P^३ Numbered 14 in A, E, H, K, L,

14, 2 in F, G, 2 in D

स एष पुरुषः समुद्रः सर्वं लोकमति । यच्च किञ्चाश्रुतेऽत्येनं
मन्यते यद्यन्तरिक्षलोकमश्रुतेऽत्येनं मन्यते यद्यमुं लोकमश्रुवी-
तात्येनं मन्येत । स एष पुरुषः पञ्चविधस्तस्य यदुष्णं तज्ज्यो-
तिर्यानि खानि स आकाशोऽथ यत्सोहितं श्येमा^१ रेतस्ता
आपो यच्छरीरं सा पृथिवी यः प्राणः स^२ वायुः । स एष
वायुः पञ्चविधः प्राणोऽपानो व्यान उदानः समानः^३ । ता
एता^४ देवताः प्राणापानयोरेव निविष्टाश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनो वा-
गिति प्राणस्य ह्यन्वपायमेता अपियन्ति । स एष वाचश्चि-
क्षस्योत्तरोत्तरिक्रमो यद्यज्ञः । स एष यज्ञः पञ्चविधोऽग्निहोत्रं
दर्शपूर्णमासौ चातुर्मास्यानि पशुः सोमः । स एष यज्ञानां
संपन्नतमो यत्सोम एतस्मिन्त्येताः पञ्चविधा अधिगम्यन्ते यत्प्रा-
क्सवनेभ्यः सैकाविधा त्रीणि सवनानि यदूर्ध्वं सा पञ्चमी ॥३॥^५

यो ह वै यज्ञे यज्ञं वेदाहन्यहर्देवेषु देवमंध्यूहं स संप्रतिवित् ।
एष वै यज्ञे यज्ञोऽहन्यहर्देवेषु देवोऽध्यूहो यदेतन्महदुक्थम् ।
तदेतत्पञ्चविधं त्रिवृत्पञ्चदशं सप्तदशमेकविंशं पञ्चविंशमिति
स्तोमतो गायत्रं रथन्तरं बृहद्ब्रह्मं राजनमिति सामतो गायत्र्यु-
ष्णिग्वृहती त्रिष्टुप्तिषदेति छन्दस्तः शिरो दक्षिणः पक्ष उत्तरः
पक्षः पुच्छमात्मेत्याख्यानम् । पञ्चकृत्वः प्रस्तौति पञ्चकृत्व उद्गा-
यति पञ्चकृत्वः प्रतिहरति पञ्चकृत्व उपद्रवति पञ्चकृत्वो निध-

^१ यमाय F.^२ श्येमा A. F.^३ स वायुः bis P.^४ समानः bis F.^५ पञ्चवि inserted in G; देवताः om. F.^६ Numbered 15 in A, E, H, K, L;

15, 3 in F, G; 3 in D.

^१ देवं—देवेषु om. F, G.^२ सप्तदश E.

नमुपयन्ति तत्सोभसहस्रं भवति । एवं हेताः पञ्च विधा
अनुशस्यन्ते यत्प्राकृचाशीतिभ्यः सैका विधा तिस्रस्तृचाशीतयो
यदूर्ध्वं सा पञ्चमी । तदेतत्सहस्रं तत्सर्वं तानि दश^१ दशेति वै
सर्वमेतावंती, हि संख्या दश दशतस्तच्छतं दशशतानि तत्सहस्रं
तत्सर्वम् । तानि चोणि छन्दांसि भवन्ति चेधा विहितं वा
इदमन्नमशनं पानं^२ खादस्तदेतराप्नोति ॥४॥

तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नम् । तद्धेतदेके नानाछन्दसां सहस्रं
प्रतिजानते किमन्यत्सदन्यद्व्यामेति । त्रिष्टुप्सहस्रमेकं जगतीस-
हस्रमेकं ऽनुष्टुप्सहस्रमेकं । तदुक्तमृषिणा । अनुष्टुभमनु चर्चूर्यमा-
णमिन्द्रं नि चिक्षुः कवयो मनीषेति ॥ वाचि वै तदैन्द्रं प्राणं
न्यचायन्नित्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति । स हेश्वरो यशस्वी कल्याणकीर्ति-
र्भवितोरीश्वरो ह तु पुरायुषः प्रैतोरिति ह स्माह कृत्नो ह्येष
आत्मा यद्वागभि हि प्राखेन^३ मनसे ऽस्यमानो वाचा नानु-
भवति । बृहतीमभिसंपादयेदेष वै कृत्न आत्मा यद्बृहती । सो
ऽयमात्मा सर्वतः शरीरिः परिवृतस्तद्यथायमात्मा सर्वतः शरीरिः
परिवृत एवमेव बृहती सर्वतश्छन्दोभिः परिवृता । मध्यं ह्येषा-
मङ्गानामात्मा मध्यं छन्दसां बृहती । स हेश्वरो यशस्वी कल्या-
णकीर्तिर्भवितोरीश्वरो ह तु पुरायुषः प्रैतोरिति ह स्माह कृत्नो-
ह्येष आत्मा यद्बृहती तस्माद्बृहतीमेवाभिसंपादयेत् ॥५॥

^१ दश om F.^२ पान om F.^३ Numbered 16 in A, E, H, K, L,

15, 4 in F, G, 4 in D

^४ ऐति E.^५ See explanatory notes^६ Numbered 17 in A, E, H, K, L,

17, 5 in F, H, 5 in D.

तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं^१ संपन्नं तस्य वा एतस्य बृहतीसहस्रस्य
 संपन्नस्यैकादशानुष्टुभां शतानि भवन्ति पञ्चविंशतिश्चानुष्टुभ-
 -श्रोत्रं वै भूयसा कनीयः । तदुक्तमृषिणा । वाचमष्टापदीमहमि-
 -त्यष्टौ हि चतुरशराणि भवन्ति । नवसक्तिमिति बृहती संपद्य-
 -माना नवसक्तिः^२ । चतस्पृशमिति सत्यं वै वागृचा स्पृष्टा ।
 इन्द्रात्परि तत्त्वं मम इति तद्यदेवैतद्बृहतीसहस्रमनुष्टुप्संपन्नं
 भवति तस्मात्तदैन्द्रात्प्राणाबृहत्यै वाचमनुष्टुभं तत्त्वं संनिर्मिमीते ।
 स वा एष वाचः परमो^३ विकारो यदेतन्महदुक्तं तदेतत्पञ्चविधं
 मितममितं स्वरः सत्यानृते इति । ऋग्गाथा कुम्भ्या तन्मितं
 यजुर्निगदो वृथावाक्तमिति सामाथो यः कथं गेष्णः सः स्वर
 ओ३मिति सत्यं नेत्यनृतम् । तदेतत्पुष्पं फलं वाचो यत्सत्यं स
 हेश्वरो यशस्वी कल्याणकीर्तिर्भवितोः पुष्पं हि फलं वाचः
 सत्यं वदति । अथैतन्मूलं वाचो यदनृतं तद्यथा वृक्ष आविर्मूलः
 शुष्यति स उद्वर्तते एवमेवानृतं वदन्नाविर्मूलमात्मानं करोति
 स शुष्यति स उद्वर्तते । तस्मादनृतं न वदेह्येत त्वेनेन । पराग्वा
 एतद्रिक्तमक्षरं यदेतदो३मिति तद्यत्किञ्चोमित्याहाचैवास्मै तद्वि-
 -च्यते स यत्सर्वमो^४ कुर्याद्रिज्यादात्मानं स कामेभ्यो नालं, स्यात् ।
 अथैतत्पूर्णमभ्यात्मं यजेति । स यत्सर्वं नेति ब्रूयात्पापिकास्य
 कीर्तिर्जायेत सैनं^५ तत्रैव हन्यात् । तस्मात्काल एव दद्यात्काले न
 दद्यात्तत्सत्यानृते मिथुनीकरोति तयोर्मिथुनात्मजायते भूयान्भ-
 -वति । यो वै तां वाचं वेद यस्या एष विकारः स संप्रतिवित् ।

^१ बृहतीसहतीसहस्र F
 See explanatory notes

^२ So I read for नवसक्ति of the MSS and add

^३ परमो A

^४ समाथो F, G

^५ सैन F

अकारो वै सर्वा वाक्सैषा स्पर्शोष्मभिर्यज्यमाना बह्वी नाना-
रूपा भवति । तस्यै यदुपांशु स प्राणोऽथ यदुच्चैस्तच्छरीरं
तस्मात्तत्तिर इव तिर इव क्षररीरमशरीरो हि प्राणोऽथ
यदुच्चैस्तच्छरीरं^१ तस्मात्तदाविराविर्हि शरीरम् ॥६॥

तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तद्यशः स इन्द्रः स भूतानाम-
धिपतिः । स य एवमेतमिन्द्रं भूतानामधिपतिं वेद विस्रसा
हैवास्मास्त्रोकाग्रितीति ह स्माह महिदास ऐतरेयः प्रेत्येन्द्रो
भूतैषु लोकेषु राजति । तदाहुर्यदनेन रूपेणामुं लोकमभिसं-
भवती^२ ३ अथ केन रूपेणैमं लोकमाभवती^३ ३ । तद्यदेतत्स्त्रियां
लोहितं भवत्यग्रेस्तदूर्ध्वं तस्मात्तस्मान्न वीभत्सेताथ यदेतत्पुरुषे
रेतो भवत्यादित्यस्य तदूर्ध्वं तस्मात्तस्मान्न वीभत्सेत । सोऽयमा-
त्मेममात्मानममुष्या आत्मने संप्रयच्छत्यसावात्मासुमात्मानमि-
मस्मा^४ आत्मने संप्रयच्छति तावन्त्योन्यमभिसंभवतोऽनेनाह रूपे-
णानुं लोकमभिसंभवत्यमुनो रूपेणैमं लोकमाभवति ॥७॥

तत्रैते श्लोकाः ।

यदक्षरं पञ्चविधं समेति । युजो युक्ता अभि यत्संवहन्ति ।
सत्यस्य सत्यमनु यच्च युज्यते । तच्च देवाः सर्व एकं भवन्ति ॥९॥

^१ तस्मात् — तच्छरीरम् bis G

^२ Numbered 18 in A, E, H, K, L, 18 7

in F, G, 5 in D

^३ em. G ^४ अभिममक्षे S¹² in text, S¹⁴⁵ in commentary ^५ Numbered

19 in A, E, H, b, L, 19 7 in F, G; 7 in D

यदक्षरादक्षरमेति युक्तम् । युजो युक्ता अभि यत्संवहन्ति ।
सत्यस्य सत्यमनु यच्च युज्यते । तच्च देवाः सर्व एकां भवन्ति ॥२॥

यद्वाच ओमिति यच्च नेति । यच्चास्याः क्रूरं यदु' चोल्ब-
णिष्णु । तद्वियूया कवयो अन्वविन्दन् । नामायत्ता समतृण-
ञ्छुतेऽधि' ॥३॥

यस्मिन्नामा समतृणञ्छुतेऽधि' । तच्च देवाः सर्वयुजो भवन्ति ।
तेन पाप्मानमपहत्य ब्रह्मणा । स्वर्गं लोकमप्येति विद्वान् ॥४॥

नैनं वाचा स्त्रियं ध्रुवन् । नैनमस्त्रीपुमान्ध्रुवन् । पुमांसं न
ध्रुवन्नेतम् । वदन्वदति कथन ॥५॥

अ' इति ब्रह्म तत्रागतमहमिति । तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं
संपन्नं तस्य वा एतस्य बृहतीसहस्रस्य संपन्नस्य षट्त्रिंशतमक्ष-
राणां सहस्राणि भवन्ति तावन्ति पुरुषायुषोऽह्नां सहस्राणि
भवन्ति । जीवाक्षरेणैव जीवाहराप्नोति जीवाह्ना जीवाक्षर-
मिति । अतकाममारोऽथ देवरथस्तस्य वागुद्धिः' ओचे पक्षसी
चक्षुषी युक्ते मनः संयहीता तदयं प्राणोऽधितिष्ठति । तदुक्तमृ-
धिणा । आ तेन यातं मनसो जवीयसा निमिषश्चिज्जवीयसेति
जवीयसेति ॥६॥

॥ इत्येतेरेयद्वितीयारण्यके तृतीयोऽध्यायः ॥

१ यदि E.

२ इति F, G.

३ इति F, G.

४ अह D, F, G;

अः K, L, S.

५ वागुद्धि A, E, G.

६ Numbered 20 in A, E, H, K, L;

20, 8 in F, G; 8 in D.

७ Text, A, L; इति द्वितीय आरण्ये तृतीयोऽध्यायः K;

द्वितीयारण्यके तृतीयोऽध्यायः F, G; इति तृतीयोऽध्यायः D; no colophon E.

ADHYĀYA 4.

आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाय आसीन्नान्यत्किञ्चन मिथत् । स ईक्षत । लोकाच्च सृजा इति । स इमाँल्लोकानसृजत । अम्मो मरीचीर्मरमायः^१ । अदोऽम्भः परेण दिवं, द्यौः प्रतिष्ठान्तरिक्षं मरीचयः, पृथिवी मरो, या अधस्तात्ता आपः । स ईक्षतेमे नु लोका लोकपालाच्च सृजा इति । सोऽह्य एव पुरुषं समुद्धृत्या-मूर्च्छयत् । तमभ्यतपन्नस्योभितप्रस्य मुखं निरभिद्यत यथाण्डं मुखाद्वाग्वाचोऽग्निः । नसिके निरभिद्येतां नासिकाभ्यां प्राणः प्राणाद्वायुः । अक्षिणी निरभिद्येतामक्षीभ्यां^२ चक्षुषश्चक्षुष आदित्यः । कर्णी निरभिद्येतां कर्णाभ्यां श्रोत्रं श्रोत्राद्दिशः । त्वङ्गिरभिद्यत त्वचो लोमानि लोमभ्य ओषधिवनस्पतयः । हृदयं निरभिद्यत^३ हृदयान्मनो मनसश्चन्द्रमाः । नाभिर्निरभिद्यत नाभ्या अपानोऽपानान्मृत्युः । शिष्टं निरभिद्यत शिष्टादेतो रेतस आपः ॥१॥

ता एता देवताः सृष्टा अस्मिन्महत्पर्यवे प्रापतंस्तमशनापिपासाभ्यामन्ववार्जत् । ता एनमश्रुवन्नायतनं नः प्रजानीहि^४ यस्मि-

^१ मयः Böhlingk. ^२ अक्षिभ्यां M, Roer and Bājānā's edd. ^३ निर-भिद्यत N, निरभिद्येतां corrected into निरभिद्यत M. ^४ In the Upanisad, in the MSS and edd of text and Śaṅkara's commentary, in Bājānā and Böhlingk's edd, and differently in T, the Khaṇḍas are subdivided into paragraphs. Śānā's division of sentences is quite different, and as neither division has any authority the numbers are ignored. S, T, Bājānā's ed, and the MSS of Śaṅkara ed. इति प्रथमः खण्डः । Numbered 21 in A, E, H, K, L; 21, 1 in F, G, 1 in D. The Upanisad MSS and edd. all prefix श्रीम्.

^१ अश्रुनायापिपासे T, Bājānā's ed here and below and in Jivānanda's ed. (cited in U as (c)). ^२ प्रजानीति P.

प्रतिष्ठिता अन्नमदामेति । ताभ्यो गामानयत्ता अनुवन्न वै
 नोऽयमलमिति । ताभ्योऽश्वमानयत्ता अनुवन्न वै नोऽयम-
 लमिति । ताभ्यः पुंरुषमानयत्ता अनुवन्सुकृतं वतेति पुरुषो
 वाव सुकृतं । ता अब्रवीद्यथायत्नं प्रविशतेति । अग्निर्वाग्भूत्वा
 मुखं प्राविशद्वायुः प्राणो भूत्वा नासिके प्राविशदादित्यश्चक्षु-
 र्भूत्वाक्षिणी प्राविशद्दिशः श्रोत्रं भूत्वा कर्णौ प्राविशन्नोषधिवन-
 स्पतयो लोमानि भूत्वा त्वचं^३ प्राविशंश्चन्द्रमा मनो भूत्वा^४ हृदयं
 प्राविशन्मृत्युरपानो भूत्वा नाभिं प्राविशदापो रेतो भूत्वा शिश्नं
 प्राविशन् । तमश्नापिपासे अब्रूतामावाभ्यामभिप्रजानीहीति ते
 अब्रवीदेतास्त्रेव वां^५ देवतास्वाभजाम्येतासु भागिन्यौ करोमीति ।
 तस्माद्यस्यै कस्यै च देवतायै हविर्गृह्यते भागिन्यावेवास्यामश-
 नापिपासे भवतः ॥२॥^६

स ईक्षतेमे नु लोकाश्च लोकपालाश्चान्नमेभ्यः सृजा इति ।
 सोऽपोऽभ्यतपत्ताभ्योऽभितप्ताभ्यो मूर्तिरजायत । या वै सा
 मूर्तिरजायतान्नं वै तत् । तदेनत्सृष्टं पराङ्म्यंजिगांसत्तद्वाचाजि-

^३ त्वचं—मूला om A, added by Colebrooke with मयसो
 *मपि Böhtlingk ^४ वा N, Rœr and Rājārāma's edd ^५ Numbered 22
 in A, F, H, K, L, 22, 2 in I, G, 2 in D; इति द्वितीयः खण्डः S, T, and MSS of
 Sukhara, in smaller print in Rājārāma's ed

^१ सोमो A. ^२ तदेतदमिष्टं M, T, Jivānanda's ed, तदत्तं U (one MS. An).
 In Saṅkara's comm, Jivānanda's ed, and five MSS of U (An, AAs, ga, cha; ja) have
 *तत् Three MSS. of U in Ānandaśrītha's *śūlā* here and two on p. 42, note 3, have
 *तत्. Rājārāma and Rœr read तदेतदमिष्टं नदत्, and clearly this is what T had
 in view. The नदत् is not recognized in the commentaries, and seems a later addition
 to the text. Böhtlingk reads *देतत्. ^३ So Böhtlingk for *घां of MSS and edd.

श्यत् । इदमदर्शमिती^३ । तस्मादिदं नानेदं ह वै नाम
तमिदं सन्तमिन्द्र^{१३} इत्याचक्षते परोक्षेण । परोक्षप्रिया^{१४} इव हि
देवाः । परोक्षप्रिया इव हि देवाः ॥३॥^{१५}

॥ इत्यितरेयद्वितीयारण्यके चतुर्थोऽध्यायः ॥^{१६}

ADHYAYA 5

पुरुषे^१ ह वा अयमादितो गर्भो भवति । यदेतद्रेतस्तदेत-
त्सर्वेभ्योऽङ्गेभ्यस्तेजः संभूतमात्मन्येवात्मानं विभर्ति तद्यदा स्त्रियां
सिञ्चत्यथैनं जनयति । तदस्य प्रथमं जन्म^२ । तस्त्रिया आत्मभूयं
गच्छति यथा स्वमङ्गं तथा । तस्मादेनां न हिनस्ति । सास्यैत-
मात्मानमच गतं भावयति सा भावयित्री भावयितव्या भवति ।

^३ इति M Boer and Rājārāma, श्री ३ म Böhlingk but cf II, 3, 7, &c ^{१३} इन्द्र-
मित्य^{१३} Boer ^{१४} पारोक्ष F ^{१५} Numbered 23 in A, E, F, II R, L, 23 3
in G, 3 in D इति तृतीयः खण्डः S, T, and MSS of Sāhkarā ^{१६} So A,
L R, द्वितीयारण्यके चतुर्थोऽध्यायः F, G, इति चतुर्थोऽध्यायः D, इति श्री ऐतरे-
योपनिषद् चतुर्थोऽध्यायः समाप्तः ॥४॥ N, इत्यितरेये द्वितीये चतुर्थं, M, no colo-
phon E, इत्यितरेये द्वितीये आरण्यके चतुर्थोऽध्यायः । उपनिषत्सु प्रथमोऽध्यायः ।
श्री तत्सत् । T, इति द्वितीयारण्यके चतुर्थोऽध्यायः K Rājārāma follows T, correcting
द्वितीये into *य

^१ Before पुरुषे, अपक्रामन्तु यमिन्धः is inserted in A, E, F, G, h, L N, R, S^{१-३}, U
But though old the words cannot be original, and are not recognized by Śāyana or
Sāhkarā ^२ इतस्त्व^२ and A ^३ इदेतद्^३ and J ^४ सर्वेभ्यः T

^५ समृत T, Rājārāma's ed - ^६ धेतव्य T, Boer, Rājārāma and J. L. Nanda's edd.,
and two MSS (ka, kha) cited in U, धेतं Böhlingk - ^७ इति प्रथमः खण्डः T,
This must be due to a mistaken idea that the 1st colophon (see = 15) means that
there are four khandas in this Adhyāya, whereas it really means that this is the fourth
khaṇḍa of the whole Upaniṣad After भावयति it has ॥४॥ treating this as a new
khaṇḍa

तं स्त्री गर्भे विभर्ति सोऽय⁸ एव कुमारं जन्मनोऽयेऽधिभावं-
यति । स यत्कुमारं जन्मनोऽयेऽधिभावयत्यात्मानमेव तद्भावं-
यति । एषां लोकानां संतत्या एवं संतता हीमे लोकाः ।
तदस्य द्वितीयं जन्म¹⁰ । सोऽस्यायमात्मा पुण्येभ्यः कर्मभ्यः
प्रतिधीयते । अथास्यायमितर आत्मा कृतकृत्यो वयोगतः प्रैति ।
स इतः प्रयत्नेव पुनर्जायते । तदस्य तृतीयं जन्म । तदुक्तमृ-
षिणा¹¹ । गर्भे नु सर्वेन्वेषामवेदमहं देवानां जनिमानि विश्वा ।
शतं मा पुर आयसीररक्षन्नाथ श्येनो जवसा निरदीयमिति ॥
गर्भे एवैतच्छयानो वामदेव एवमुवाच¹² । स एवं विद्वानस्मा-
च्छरीरभेदादूर्ध्वं उत्क्रम्यामुष्मिन्स्वर्गे लोके सर्वान्कामानाप्त्वा-
मृतः समभवत्समभवात्¹³ ।

॥ इत्यितरेयद्वितीयारण्यके पञ्चमोऽध्यायः ॥¹⁶

⁸ om Döbbling

⁹ तद् om N.

¹⁰ ॥ २ ॥ इति द्वितीयः खण्डः T.

¹¹ प्रतिनिधीयते T. This is an obvious error, and is borrowed from Śaṅkara's com-
mentary.

¹² ॥ १ ॥ इति तृतीयः खण्डः T.

¹³ गर्भे नु सनुक् I, S has 'प्रथः

as have U, Röer, Benares, and Rājārāma's edd.

¹⁴ ॥ १ ॥ T.

¹⁵ ॥ २ ॥ T.

T continues इति चतुर्थः खण्डः ॥ ४ ॥ and so S, U, and MSS of Śaṅkara Numbered
24 in A, B, H, K, L; 24, 7 in F, G, not numbered in D, numbered 24 in R.
Before the number, A, S⁴⁻⁹, Benares ed (somew 1941), and U insert यथास्मान्
तु (om. U) गर्भिन्ः. See on II, 6 The words are not recognized by Śaṅkara
or Sūrya, and cannot be genuine.

¹⁶ Text, R; इति द्वितीयारण्यके

पञ्चमोऽध्यायः A; इति द्वितीय आरण्यके पञ्चमोऽध्यायः L; इति द्वितीय आरण्यके
पञ्चमोऽध्यायः K; द्वितीयारण्यके पञ्चमोऽध्यायः F, G; इति पञ्चमोऽध्यायः D; no
colophon E; इति ऐतरेये पञ्चमः M; इत्यितरेये द्वितीये आरण्यके पञ्चमोऽध्यायः ।
उपनिषत्सु द्वितीयोऽध्यायः । ओ तत्सत् T; 4 only N. Rājārāma has इत्यितरेयारण्यके
and then as in T.

ADHYĀYA 6

[कोऽयमात्मेति वयमुपास्महे कतरः स आत्मा । येन वाः पश्यति येन वाः शृणोति येन वा गन्थानाजिघ्रति येन वा वाचं व्याकरोति येन वा स्वादु चास्वादु च विजानाति । यदेतद्दृढं मनश्चेतत्संज्ञानमाज्ञानं विज्ञानं प्रज्ञानं मेधाः दृष्टिर्धृतिर्मतिर्मनीषा जूतिः स्मृतिः संकल्पः क्रतुरमुः कामो वश इति । सर्वाण्येवैतानि प्रज्ञानस्य नामधेयानि भवन्ति]॥ एषः ब्रह्मैष इन्द्र एष प्रजापतिरेते सर्वे देवा इमानि च पञ्च महाभूतानि पृथिवी वायुराकाश आपो ज्योतीर्धीत्येतानीमानि च क्षुद्रमिच्छाणीव बीजानीतराणि चेताराणि^४ चारुजानि^५ च स्वेदजानि चोद्भिज्जानि^{१०} चाश्वा गावः पुरुषा हस्तिनो यत्किञ्चेदं प्राणि जङ्गमं च पतत्रि च यच्च स्यावरं सर्वं तत्प्रज्ञानेचं^{११} प्रज्ञाने प्रतिष्ठितं प्रज्ञानेचो^{१२} लोकः प्रज्ञा प्रतिष्ठा प्रज्ञानं^{१३} ब्रह्म । स एतेन^{१४} प्रज्ञेनात्मनास्माँल्लोकादुत्क्र-

^१ यथास्मान् तु गर्भिन्य is here inserted in R. It is omitted by D E F G, H I L, N T, and in Sitarāma's text, and by Hoer and Rajārāma. See on II^५ यमः Max Muller and Böhlingk. ^२ रूप inserted in T in Hoer, Jivananda and Rajārāma's edd. It is clearly borrowed from Śaṅkara's commentary.

^३ शब्दान inserted in T. शब्द in Hoer Jivananda and Rajārāma's edd.

^४ दृष्टिर् F स्मृति om Benares ed. ^५ स added in T. ^७ बीजानित

राणि I. ^८ चक्षुष्याणि A. ^९ जात्रि only F. वरायुः Böhlingk.

^{१०} The spelling with two j's is supported by I M, T U, Rajārāma and Sitarāma's edd. against Benares ed., R and S. ^{११} प्रज्ञानेच om F G. ^{१२} प्रज्ञानेच D.

^{१३} प्रज्ञान ब्रह्म om I. ^{१४} एतेनैव T.

म्यामुष्मिन्स्वर्गे लोके सर्वान्कामानाप्त्वामृतः समभवत्सम-
भवत्¹⁵ ॥

॥ इत्यितरेयद्वितीयारण्यके षष्ठोऽध्यायः ॥¹⁶

॥ इति द्वितीयारण्यकम् ॥

This ends the second Āranyaka, but the majority of the MSS. of the text, and of Sāyana's commentary, and of Ānandatīrtha's own commentary, and his *ākā*, add a seventh Adhyāya, which is:—

ADHYĀYA 7.

वाङ्मे मनसि प्रतिष्ठिता मनो मे वाचि प्रतिष्ठिताविरा-
वीर्मे एधि वेदस्य म आणी स्थः श्रुतं मे मा प्रहासीरन्तेनाधी-
तेनाहोराचांस्संदधाम्यृतं वदिष्यामि सत्यं वदिष्यामि¹ तन्मामवतु
तद्वक्तारमवतवतु मामवतु वक्तारमवतु वक्तारम् ॥

॥ इत्यितरेयद्वितीयारण्यके सप्तमोऽध्यायः ॥²

¹⁵ इति पद्यमः खण्डः ॥५॥ T, U, MSS of Śaṅkara; numbered 25 in A, E, H, K, L, not numbered in D, F, G, 5 in N ¹⁶ Text, R; इति द्वितीयारण्यके षष्ठोऽध्यायः ॥६॥ A, इति द्वितीयारण्यके षष्ठोऽध्यायः L, इति द्वितीय आरण्य षष्ठोऽध्यायः K; द्वितीयारण्यके षष्ठोऽध्यायः F, G, इति षष्ठोऽध्यायः D, M; no colophon in E, N; इति ऐतरेये द्वितीये आरण्यके षष्ठोऽध्यायः । उपनिषत्सु द्वितीयोऽध्यायः । श्रीं तत्सत् । T. L adds द्वितीयारण्यके समाप्त । Tāpārāma's ed. begins इत्यितरेयारण्यके, and then = T

¹ 'विराविर्मे' K, see on I, 1, 1, in the Śāntimantra, Egging, *Indica Office Catalogue*, p. 117.

² प्रहासीदु T, and Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rigveda* ³ वादिष्या A here.

⁴ 'मा ३म् D ⁵ This occurs in A, D, E, F, G, H, I, K, M, N, O, Q, R, S, T, U.

At R; however, it is placed at the beginning of the 31st mantra, and at R it is the end of Āranyaka V, and see also note on I, 1, 1. It does not occur in most MSS of

Saṅkara's commentary, and it is omitted even in I₄, which is a complete MS of all the text. It appears clearly not to have been known to Saṅkara. It is, however, known to Ānandatīrtha in his own commentary in the MSS, H and O. In the edition, U, of Ānandatīrtha's commentary on Saṅkara, it is said: षष्ठ्यष्टस्य भाष्यं स्रष्टत्वादात्मतत्वाप्रतिपादनाच्च श्रीमच्छङ्कराचार्येन कृतमित्येतदुक्तान् एव ज्ञायते । सा तु टीका दीपिकातोऽभिज्ञेवेति ज्ञात्वा च न संगृहीता । M, N, Q, and apparently Max Muller's MS., B B E. I, 246, n 2, have एवं षष्ठेऽध्याये तत्त्वविद्या परिसमाप्य सप्तमे (so N, Q, सप्तमं श्रीमत्परिब्राजकाचार्य add M) शान्तिकरी मन्त्रः पठितः वाङ्मो मनसीत्यादि । तस्य स्रष्टार्यत्वादात्मतत्वाप्रतिपादकत्वाच्च भाष्यकरिर्न व्याख्यातः । स मन्त्रानां बोधाय दीपिकाकारोक्तरीत्या व्याख्यायते । पद्योक्तं &c, exactly as in Śāyana's commentary. The end is इति श्रीसप्तमाध्यायस्य दीपिका संपूर्णा M, इति सप्तमाध्यायदीपिका समाप्ता N. The question arises whether this wholesale borrowing was due to Ānandatīrtha or not. On the whole the evidence is against the view that it was. (a) It compels us to date Ānandatīrtha after Śāyana, which is (a) contradictory to the accepted dates of either writer, and (b) cannot be reconciled with the fact that Śāyana sometimes follows Ānandatīrtha closely in his commentary, cf. on II, 4, 3. (2) It is of course clear from the consensus of MS evidence that the explanation of the last section was added at a comparatively early date to Ānandatīrtha's commentary, but this could easily have happened, and as a matter of fact the alteration needed to introduce the extract was very slight, as Śāyana begins षष्ठे तत्त्वविद्या परिसमाप्य सप्तमे शान्तिकरं मन्त्रं पठति । वाङ्मो मनसीति । The addition was very natural, since the fact that the Adhyāya is recognized by Ānandatīrtha in his own commentary shows that it had already in his time become a recognized part of the Āranyaka. In Jones' MS (Tawney and Thomas Catalogue of Two Collections of Sanskrit MSS, p 2) we have the commentary of Saṅkara without the pad, followed by 'Mādhava's' commentary as in the edition. After II, 7, H continues हरिः श्रीः । अथातस्संहिताया उपनिषत् । वाङ्मो मनसि प्रतिष्ठिता । खीऽयमादिति वयमुपासहे । पुरये ह वा अयमादितो वर्मो भवति । स ईक्षते नु लोकाय लोकपासाय । ता एता देवतास्मृष्टाः । आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाय आसीत् । तर्जते लोकाः । तदा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तद्यज्ञस्य इन्द्रः । तदा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तस्य वा एतस्य । तदा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तदेतदेके । यो ह वै यज्ञे यज्ञं वेद । स एष पुरुषस्समुद्रः । तस्य य आत्मानमाविश्वरा वेद । यो ह वा आत्मानं पञ्चविधमुत्कर्षं वेद । तदा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तस्य याचि ब्रह्मणानि । विद्यामिदं ह्येतदहस्यसिष्यन्तम् । एष च एष विध्वजः । एष इदं लोकाभ्यार्चयत् । आपाः इति आप इति । अथातो

विभूतयोऽस्य पुष्टयस्य । तस्य चाक्तनिर्नामानि दामानि । त देवाः प्राणयन्त तं
 प्रपदान्या प्रापयत । अथातो रेतसं सृष्टिः । उक्थमुक्थमिति वै प्रजा वदन्ति । एष पन्था
 एतत्कर्त्तुं । एष पन्था अष्टौ । एष दमस्तत्वारि । यो ह वा आत्मानमष्टौ । आत्मा वै
 चयः । पुष्टय एका । कोऽयमेका । वाङ्म एका । एष पन्था विश्वामिशं ह्यात्मा -
 वै षट् । हरिः श्रीः । इति द्वितीयारण्य समाप्तम् । The other MSS end as follows
 ॥ २६ ॥ इत्यितरेयद्वितीयारण्यके सप्तमोऽध्यायः । द्वितीयारण्यक समाप्त । A, ॥ २६ ॥
 इति सप्तमोऽध्यायः ॥ ७ ॥ इति द्वितीयमारण्यक समाप्त । F, ॥ २६ ॥ ४ ॥ (rest as in
 F) G, इति सप्तमोऽध्यायः द्वितीयारण्यः D, ॥ २६ ॥ इति द्वितीय आरण्ये सप्तमो-
 ऽध्यायः । समाप्तः K B ends as in text, but with समाप्तः added

॥ अथ तृतीयारण्यकम् ॥

ADHYĀYA 1.

‘अथातः’ संहिताया’ उपनिषत् । पृथिवी पूर्वरूपं द्यौरुत्तर-
रूपं वायुः संहितेति माण्डूकेय आकाशः संहितेत्यस्य माण्डूके
वेदयाञ्चक्रे । स हाविपरिहृतो मेने न मेऽस्य पुत्रेण समगा-
दिति । समाने चै तत्परिहृतो मेन इत्यागस्त्यः समानं ह्येतद्भवति
वायुश्चाकाशश्च^१ । इत्यधिदैवतम् । अथाध्यात्मम् । वाक्पूर्वरूपं
मन उत्तररूपं प्राणः संहितेति^२ शूरवीरो^३ माण्डूकेयः । अथ
‘ह्यस्य पुत्र आह ज्येष्ठी मनः पूर्वरूपं वागुत्तररूपं मनसा’ वा
अये संकल्पयत्यथ वाचा व्याहरति तस्मान्मन एव पूर्वरूपं
वागुत्तररूपं प्राणस्त्वेव संहितेति । ‘समानमेनयोरथ पितुश्च
पुत्रस्य च । स एषोऽश्वरथः प्रष्टिवाहनो मनोवाक्प्राणसंहतः’ ।
स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया^४ पशुभिर्व्यशसा
ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति । इति नु माण्डूके-
यानाम् ॥१॥

अथ. शाकल्यस्य । पृथिवी पूर्वरूपं द्यौरुत्तररूपं वृष्टिः संधिः
पर्जन्यः संधाता । तदुतापि यच्चैतद्वलवदनुद्बृहन्संदधदहोरात्रे

^१ संहिताय B. ^२ च only, B, B, &c, चेति S. ^३ संहिते A. ^४ भूरो
वीरो E. ^५ मगसिवायि B. ^६ संहितः B; संहिनुतः E. ^७ प्रजय B.

^१ गू B, S, &c.; corr. Bohlingk; cf. Śākhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, 2.

वर्पति द्यावापृथिव्यौ समधातामित्युताण्याहुः । इती^१ न्वधिदै-
वतम् । अथाध्यात्मम् । पुरुषो ह वा अयं सर्व आनन्दं द्वे विदले
भवत इत्याहुस्तस्येदमेव पृथिव्या रूपमिदं दिवस्तत्रायमन्तरे-
णाकाशे यथासौ द्यावापृथिव्यावन्तरेणाकाशः । तस्मिन्हांसि-
न्नाकाशे प्राण आयतो यथामुष्मिन्नाकाशे वायुरायतः । यथा-
मूनि चीणि ज्योतीष्येवमिमानि पुरुषे चीणि^२ ज्योतीषि
यथासौ दिव्यादित्य एवमिदं^३ शिरसि चक्षुर्यथासावन्तरिक्षे
विद्युदेवमिदमात्मनि हृदयं यथायमग्निः पृथिव्यामेवमिदमुपस्ये
रेतः । एवमु ह स्म सर्वलोकमात्मानमनुविधायाहेदमेव
पृथिव्या रूपमिदं दिवः । स य एवमेतां संहितां^४ वेद
संधीयते प्रजया पशुभिर्मशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन
सर्वमायुरेति ॥२॥

[अथातो निर्भुजप्रवादाः । पृथिव्यायतनं निर्भुज दिव्यायतनं
प्रतृणमन्तरिक्षायतनमुभयमन्तरेण । अथ यद्येनं निर्भुजं ब्रुवन्त-
मुपवदेदच्योष्टावराभ्या^५ स्थानाभ्यामित्येनं ब्रूयात् । अथ यद्येनं
प्रतृणं ब्रुवन्तमुपवदेदच्योष्टा उत्तराभ्यां स्थानाभ्यामित्येनं ब्रूयात् ।
यस्त्वैवोभयमन्तरेणाह तस्य नास्त्युपवादः । यद्धि संधि विवर्त-
यति तन्निर्भुजस्य रूपमथ यच्छुद्धे अक्षरे अभिव्याहरति तत्प्र-
तृणस्याय उ एवोभयमन्तरेणोभयं व्याप्तं भवति]

^१ इति S^{१२५}^२ विवस् १ वस् F^४ So I read for तस्मिन्हस्मिन् II

G H K L S तस्मिन्नाकाशे F तस्मिन्नस्मिन्नाकाशे A R यथा—वायुर lost in B

^५ चीणि—एदं lost in B^६ एवमिदमु lost in B^७ संहितां II, सप्त F^१ एव आभ्या B

निर्भुजं ब्रूयात्स्वर्गकामः प्रतृणमुभयकाम उभयमन्तरेण । अथ
यद्येतं निर्भुजं ब्रुवन्तं पर उपवदेत्पृथिवीं देवतामारः पृथिवी त्वा
देवता रिष्यतीत्येनं ब्रूयात् । अथ यद्येतं प्रतृणं ब्रुवन्तं पर उप-
वदेद्दिवं^२ देवतामारो^३ द्यौस्त्वा देवता रिष्यतीत्येनं ब्रूयात् । अथ
यद्येतमुभयमन्तरेण ब्रुवन्तं पर उपवदेदन्तरिक्षं^४ देवतामारो
ऽन्तरिक्षं त्वा देवता रिष्यतीत्येनं ब्रूयात् । यथा तु कथा च
ब्रुवन्वा^५ ब्रुवन्तं वा ब्रूयादभ्याशमेव यत्तथा स्यात् । न त्वेवान्य-
त्कुशलाद्वाहणं ब्रूयात् । अतिद्युम्न^६ एव ब्राह्मणं ब्रूयात् ।
नातिद्युम्ने च न ब्राह्मणं ब्रूयान्नमो^७ अस्तु ब्राह्मणेभ्य इति ह
स्नाह शूरवीरो माण्डूकेयः ॥३॥

अथातोऽनुष्याहाराः । प्राणो वंश इति विद्यात् । स य एनं
प्राणं वंशमुपवदेच्छक्रुवच्चेन्मन्येत प्राणं^८ वंशं समधाँ^९ प्राणं
मा वंशं संदधत् न शक्नोषीत्याह प्राणस्त्वा वंशो हास्यतीत्येनं
ब्रूयात् । अथ चेदशक्रुवन्तं^{१०} मन्येत प्राणं वंशं समधित्तिषं तं
नाशकः संधातुं प्राणस्त्वा वंशो हास्यतीत्येनं ब्रूयात् । यथा तु
कथा च ब्रुवन्वा^५ ब्रुवन्तं वा ब्रूयादभ्याशमेव यत्तथा स्यात् । न
त्वेवान्यत्कुशलाद्वाहणं ब्रूयात् । अतिद्युम्न एव ब्राह्मणं ब्रूयात् ।

^२ ऋषति B^३ देदिव F, G^४ देवतामरी A.^५ नंसु B.^६ उपवदवदेद्र A^७ अन्तरिक्षं देवतामारो om L, अन्तरीक्षं

B in text

^८ See explanatory notes^९ अतिद्युम्ने—ब्रूयान् om. F, G^{१०} नमो शु B^१ चिन् om II^२ प्राणवंशं B:^३ समधाँ A, B^४ ऋषति B.^५ See explanatory notes on III, 1, 3^६ अभ्याशम् B, E (yet correctly in III, 1, 4)

नातिद्युम्ने' चन ब्राह्मणं ब्रूयान्नमो अस्तु^१ ब्राह्मणेभ्य इति ह
स्माह श्रूवीरो माण्डूकेयः ॥४॥

अथ खल्वाहुर्निर्भुजवक्त्राः । पूर्वमक्षरं^१ पूर्वरूपमुत्तरमुत्तर-
रूपं योऽवकाशः पूर्वरूपोत्तररूपे अन्तरेण सा संहितेति । स
य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया^२ पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्म-
वर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति । अथ वयं ब्रूमो निर्भु-
जवक्त्रा इति ह स्माह ह्रस्वो माण्डूकेयः पूर्वमेवाक्षरं पूर्वरूपमु-
त्तरमुत्तररूपं योऽवकाशः पूर्वरूपोत्तररूपे अन्तरेण येन संधिं
विवर्तयति येन स्वरास्वरं^३ विजानाति येन माचामाचां विभ-
जते सा संहितेति । स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया^४
पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति । अथ
हास्य पुनः^५ आह मध्यमः प्राचीवोधीपुनोऽक्षरे खल्विमे अवि-
कर्पन्ननेकीकुर्वन्पथावर्णमाह तद्यासौ माचा पूर्वरूपोत्तररूपे
अन्तरेण संधिविज्ञपनी साम तज्ज्वति सामैवाहं संहितां मन्य
इति । तदप्येतदृषिणोक्तम् । बृहस्पते न परः साम्नो^६ विदुरिति ॥
स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्म-
वर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति ॥५॥

^१ भाद्युक्ते A

^२ मनो जु B

^३ पूर्वरूपम् F

^४ रूपम् only B

^५ प्रजयाः B (with *prajamāyā* = usual)

^६ उत्तरम् om G

^७ स्वरा स्वर A, K, L, स्वरास्वर B

^८ पुन आह om B

^९ प्राचीवोधी B

^{१०} नेकीकुर्वन् B

^{११} अवि—प्रज lost in B

^{१२} साम्ना G

^{१३} सर्वमायुरे lost in B

बृहद्रथन्तरं यो रूपेण संहिता संधीयत इति तारुह्यः^१ । वाग्वै
 रथन्तरस्य रूपं प्राणो बृहत उभाभ्यामु खलु संहिता संधीयते
 वाचा च प्राणेन च । एतस्यां ह सोपनिषदि संवत्सरं गा रक्ष-
 यते तारुह्यः^२ । एतस्यां^३ ह स मावायां संवत्सरं गा रक्षयते
 तारुह्यः । तदप्येतदृषिणीकृतम् । रथन्तरमा जभारा वसिष्ठो भर-
 द्वाजो बृहदा चक्रे अग्नेरिति ॥ स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते
 प्रजया^४ पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति ।
 वाक्प्राणेन संहितेति^५ कौण्डरयः प्राणः पवमानेन पवमानो
 विश्वेदेवैर्विश्वे देवाः स्वर्गेण लोकेन स्वर्गो लोको ब्रह्मणा
 सैषावरपरा संहिता । स यो हैतामवरपरां संहितां वेदैव हिव
 स प्रजया पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन संधीयते^६
 यथैषा संहिता । ॥ यदि परेण वोपमृतः^७ स्वेन वार्धेनाभि-
 व्याहरेदभिव्याहार्धत्वेन विद्याद्विवं संहितागमद्विदुषां देवानामेवं
 भविष्यतीति । शश्वत्तया स्यात् । स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद
 संधीयते प्रजया पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन^८
 सर्वमायुरेति । वाक्संहितेति पञ्चालचराडः । वाचा वै वेदाः
 संधीयन्ते वाचा छन्दांसि वाचा मित्राणि संदधति वाचा
 सर्वाणि भूतान्यथो वागेवेदं सर्वमिति । तद्यच्चैतदधीते वा भाषते

^१ तारुह्यः B, D, H, S (but S¹³⁴⁶ has तारुह्यः).

^२ तारुह्यः A (marked as

incorrect), H, D, H, S (but not S³⁴⁵)

^३ एतस्या—तद् om. B; तारुह्यः A;

तारुह्यः D, H, L (elsewhere तारुह्यः), S (but not S³⁴⁵⁷⁹)

om. F.

^४ पशु B.

^५ प्रजयः B

^६ वाक्च L.

^७ संहिते B.

^८ संधीयते—लोकेन om. F, G.

^९ छन्दः or *जः B.

^{१०} व्याहरेद B.

व्याहार्धं नेत्येव R in text, वि विद्यात् K, read perhaps *हरत्.

वा वाचि तदा प्राणो भवति वाक्त्वा प्राणं रेळ्ळ्यथ यच्च तूष्णीं
 वा¹¹ भवति स्वपिति वा¹² प्राणे तदा वाग्भवति प्राणस्तदा
 वाचं रेळ्ळि तावन्त्योन्यं रेळ्ळो वाग्वै माता प्राणः पुत्रः । तदप्ये-
 तदृषिणोक्तम् । एकः सुपर्णः स समुद्रमा विवेश स इदं विश्वं
 भुवनं वि चष्टे । तं पाकेन मनसापश्यमन्तितस्तं¹³ माता रेळ्ळि
 स उ रेळ्ळि मातरमिति ॥ स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते
 प्रजया पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति ।
 अथातः प्रजापतिसंहिता । जाया पूर्वरूपं पतिरुत्तररूपं पुत्रः
 संधिः प्रजननं संधानं सैषादिति¹⁴ संहिता । अदितिर्हीदं सर्वं
 यदिदं किञ्च पिता च माता च पुत्रश्च प्रजननं च । तदप्येतदृषि-
 णोक्तम् । अदितिर्माता स पिता स पुत्र इति ॥ स य एवमेतां
 संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया¹⁵ पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण
 लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति सर्वमायुरेति ॥ ६ ॥

॥ इत्यैतरेयतृतीयारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥”

ADIMĀLA 2.

प्राणो वंश इति स्थविरः शकल्यः । तद्यथा शालावंशे सर्वे
 ऽन्ये वंशाः समाहिताः स्युरेवमस्मिन्प्राणे चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनो

¹¹ वाग् B ¹² वा om A, वाक् G ¹³ तस्मा B, मात D ¹⁴ स
 सैषादि* B ¹⁵ प्रजयः B, which also has *gda* for *ta*. ¹⁶ Text A (with
 समाप्तः), II. इत्युग्वेदसंहितारण्ये प्रथमोऽध्यायः B, तृतीयारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः F,
 तृतीय आरण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः G, इति तृतीय आरण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः K, इति
 चणोद्देशोऽध्यायः L, प्रथमोऽध्यायः D, no copy from E.

¹ एतस्मिन् B.

वाग्निन्द्रियाणि शरीरं सर्वं आत्मा समाहितः । तस्यैतस्यात्मनः
 प्राण ऊष्मरूपमस्थीनि स्पर्शरूपं मज्जानः स्वरूपं मांसं
 लोहितमित्येतदन्यच्चतुर्थमन्तस्थारूपमिति ह स्माह ह्रस्वो मा-
 शदूकेयः । चयं त्वेव न^१ एतत्प्रोक्तम् । तस्यैतस्य चयस्यास्था^२
 मज्जां पर्वणामिति चीणीतः^३ षष्टिशतानि चीणीतस्तानि सप्त
 विंशतिशतानि^४ भवन्ति सप्त च वै शतानि विंशतिश्च^५ संवत्स-
 रस्याहोरात्राः । स एषोऽहःसंमानश्चक्षुर्मयः श्रोत्रमयश्छन्दोमयो
 मनोमयो वाङ्मय आत्मा । स य एवमेतमहःसंमानं चक्षुर्मयं
 श्रोत्रमयं^६ छन्दोमयं मनोमयं वाङ्मयमात्मानं वेदाहं सायुज्यं
 सरूपतां सलोकतामप्नुते पुत्री पशुमान्भवति सर्वमायुरेति ॥१॥^७

अथ कीदृशव्यः । चीणि षष्टिशतान्यक्षराणां चीणि षष्टि-
 शतान्यूपमणां चीणि षष्टिशतानि संधीनाम् । यान्यक्षराण्यवो-
 चामाहानि तानि यान्यूपमणोऽवोचाम^८ रात्रयस्ता यान्संधीनं वो-
 चामाहोरात्राणां ते संधय इत्यधिदैवतम् । अथाध्यात्मम् । यान्य-
 क्षराण्यधिदैवतमवोचामास्थीनि तान्यध्यात्मम् । यान्यूपमणो
 ऽधिदैवतमवोचाम मज्जानस्तेऽध्यात्मम् । एष ह वै संप्रति-
 प्राणो यन्मज्जैतद्रेतो न ह वा ऋते^९ प्राणाद्रेतः सिच्यते यद्वा
 ऋते^{१०} प्राणाद्रेतः सिच्येत पूयेव^{११} संभवेत् । यान्संधीनं अधिदैवतम-

^१ *मनास्थारूपम् B and the other MSS., besides R and S. ^२ न इत् B, cf. on III, 2, 2. ^३ B inserts ३(?) after each of the three genitives and nasalizes पर्वणां. ^४ चीणि B. ^५ सप्त विंशतिश्च B, as reported by Max Müller, but this is wrong. ^६ विशतिश्च A; संवत्स B. ^७ *मानच B. ^८ Lost to end in B, except वर्मायुरेति. ^९ Numbered 7 in A, E, F, G, H, K, L, 7 in B, D. ^{१०} चामाह (?) B. ^{११} सन्धीन्य B. ^{१२} रिते B. ^{१३} पूयेन B.

वोचाम पर्वणि तान्यध्यात्मम् । तस्यैतस्य^१ चयस्यास्थां मज्ज्ञां
पर्वणामिति पञ्चेतश्चत्वारिंशच्छतानि पञ्चेतस्तदशीतिसहस्रं भव-
त्यशीतिसहस्रं वा अर्केलिन्नो बृहतीरहरभिसंपादयन्ति । स एषो
ऽक्षरसंमानश्चक्षुर्मयः श्रोत्रमयश्छन्दोमयो मनोमयो^२ वाङ्मय
आत्मा । स य एवमेतमक्षरसंमानं चक्षुर्मयं श्रोत्रमयं छन्दोमयं
मनोमयं वाङ्मयमात्मानं वेदाक्षराणां सायुज्यं सरूपतां सलो-
कतामश्नुते^३ पुत्री पशुमान्भवति सर्वमायुरेति ॥२॥^४

चत्वारः पुरुषा इति^१ बाधः^२ शरीरपुरुषश्छन्दःपुरुषो वेद-
पुरुषो महापुरुष इति । शरीरपुरुष इति यमवोचाम स य
एवायं^३ दैहिक आत्मा तस्य योऽयमशरीरः प्रज्ञात्मा स रसः ।
छन्दःपुरुष इति यमवोचामाक्षरसमाज्ञाय एव तस्यैतस्याकारो
रसः । वेदपुरुष इति यमवोचाम येन वेदान्वेद ऋग्वेदं यजुर्वेदं
सामवेदं तस्यैतस्य ब्रह्मा रसः । तस्माद्ब्रह्माणं^४ ब्रह्मिष्ठं कुर्वीत
यो यज्ञस्योत्पन्नं पश्येत् । महापुरुष इति यमवोचाम संवत्सर
एव प्रध्वंसयन्नन्यानि भूतान्येका भावयन्नन्यानि^५ तस्यैतस्यासा-
वादित्यो रसः । स यश्चायमशरीरः प्रज्ञात्मा यश्चासावादित्य
एकमेतदिति विद्यात् । तस्मात्पुरुषं पुरुषं प्रत्यादित्यो भवति ।

^१ B inserts चय सिद्ध ज इत्येतत्प्रोक्तम् which is borrowed from III 2 1 above and reads तस्यैतस्य चयस्यासायात्मम् ^२ करि B ^३ *रहरहर् II and संपादयन्ति

^४ am B ^५ अनुमान F om thing पुत्री पशुमान् ^६ Numbered 8 in A E
H K L, 1 8 in F G 2 in B D

^१ इति om and la una marked in 1

^२ बाध R in text.

^३ *हम् II

^४ ब्रह्मण II

^५ *नान्यानि B

तदपेतदृषिणोक्तम् । चिवं देवानामुदगादनीकं चक्षुर्मिचस्य
वरुणस्याग्नेः । आप्रा द्यावापृथिवी अन्तरिक्षं सूर्य आत्मा जग-
तस्तस्युषश्चेति ॥ एतामनुविधं^१ संहितां संधीयमानां मन्य इति
ह स्माह वाध्वः । एतं ह्येव बहूचा महत्युक्थे मीमांसन्त एत-
मयावध्वर्यव एतं महाव्रते छन्दोगा एतमस्यामेतं दिव्येतं वाया-
वेतमाकाश एतमप्स्वेतमोषधीष्वेतं वनस्पतिष्वेतं चन्द्रमस्येतं
नक्षत्रेष्वेतं सर्वेषु भूतेष्वेतमेव ब्रह्मेत्याचक्षते । न एष संवत्सरसं-
मानश्चक्षुर्मयः श्रोत्रमयश्छन्दोमयो मनोमयो वाङ्मय आत्मा ।
स य एवमेतं संवत्सरसंमानं चक्षुर्मयं श्रोत्रमयं छन्दोमयं
मनोमयं वाङ्मयमात्मानं परस्मै शंसति ॥ ३ ॥^२

दुग्धदोहा अस्य वेदा भवन्ति न तस्यानूक्ते^३ भागोऽस्ति न
वेद सुकृतस्य पन्थानमिति । तदपेतदृषिणोक्तम् । यस्तित्याज
सचिविदं सखायं न तस्य वाच्यमि भागो अस्ति । यदीं णृणो-
त्यलकं णृणोति न हि^४ प्र वेद सुकृतस्य पन्थामिति ॥ न
तस्यानूक्ते भागोऽस्ति न वेद सुकृतस्य पन्थानमित्येतत्तदुक्तं
भवति । तस्मादेवं विद्वान् परस्मा श्रमिं^५ चिनुयान् परस्मै
महाव्रतेन सुवीत न परस्मा एतदहः शंसेत् । कामं पिबे
वाचार्याय वा शंसेदात्मन एवास्य तत्कृतं भवति । स यश्चाय-
मशरीरः प्रज्ञात्मा यश्चासावादित्य एकमेतदित्यवोचाम । तौ

^१ वितांक B. ^२ गधिषु B. ^३ मचवेतं B. ^४ Numbered 9 in
A, E, H, K, L; 3, 9 in F, G; -3 in B, D.

^५ नक्ष B. ^६ हि—यधिम all, save a few letters and the following म परस्मा,
lost in D.

यत्र विहीयेते चन्द्रमा इवादित्यो^१ दृश्यते न रश्मयः प्रादुर्भवन्ति
लोहिनी द्यौर्भवति यथा मञ्जिष्ठा व्यस्तः पायुः काककुलायग-
न्धिकमस्य शिरो वायति संपरेतोऽस्यात्मा न^२ चिरमिव जीवि-
ष्यतीति^३ विद्यात् । स यत्करणीयं मन्येत तत्कुर्वीत यदन्ति यच्च
दूरक इति सप्त जपेदादित्प्रत्नस्य रेतस इत्येका यत्र ग्रहा
पवमानेति षष्ठुद्वयं तमसस्परीत्येका । अथापि यच्च छिद्र इवा-
दित्यो दृश्यते रचनाभिरिवाभिख्यायेत छिद्रां वा छायां पश्येत्त-
दप्येवमेव विद्यात् । अथाप्यादर्शं वोदके वा जिह्मशिरसं वा-
शिरसं^४ वात्मानं पश्येद्विपर्यस्ते वा कन्याके जिह्मेन वा दृश्ये-
यातां तदप्येवमेव विद्यात् । अथाप्यपिधायाक्षिणी उपेक्षेत
तद्यथा वटिरकाणि^५ संपतन्तीव^६ दृश्यन्ते तानि यदा न पश्येत्त-
दप्येवमेव विद्यात् । अथाप्यपिधाय कर्णा उपशृणुयात्स एषो
अप्तेरिव प्रज्वलतो^७ रश्म्येवोपच्छिस्तं^८ यदा न शृणुयात्तदप्ये-
वमेव विद्यात् । अथापि यच्च नील इवाग्निर्दृश्यते यथा मयूर-
यीर्वा^९मेघे वा विद्युतं^{१०} पश्येन्मेघे वा विद्युतं न पश्येन्महामेघे
वा मरीचीरिव पश्येत तदप्येवमेव विद्यात् । अथापि यच्च भूमिं
ज्वलन्तीमिव पश्येत तदप्येवमेव विद्यात् । इति प्रत्यक्षदर्श-
नानि । अथ स्वप्नाः^{११} । पुरुषं कृष्णं कृष्णदन्तं पश्यति स एनं

^१ एवादित्यो B^२ न म F, G^३ जीवषि (य) थति B^४ वाशरीरमात्मान B, वाशिरस om A, D pr man, G, D has कान्यके infra^५ वटिरकाणि B^६ संपतन्तीवा B, संपतन्ती II in text, सपतन्तीव A, D, F^७ I, G, H, k, L S.^८ ज्वलतो B^९ रश्म्य—य om B in text The words

are in all MSS.

^{१०} मयूरयीव. (or वा) यमेघे B^{११} B add k^{१२} दर्शनादन् and स्वप्नः B, II has in commentary स्वप्नाः उच्यते

हन्ति वराह¹⁴ एनं हन्ति मर्कट एनमास्कन्दयथाशु वायुरेनं
 प्रवहति सुवर्णं खादित्वापगिरति¹⁵ मध्वघ्नाति विसानि भक्षय-
 न्येकपुण्डरीकं धारयति खरैर्वराहैर्युक्तैर्याति कृष्णां धेनुं कृष्णवत्सां
 नलदमाली दक्षिणामुखो प्राजयति । स यद्येतेषां किञ्चित्प्रश्ये-
 दुपोष पायसं स्थालीपाकं अपयित्वा रात्रीसूक्तेन¹⁶ प्रत्यूचं
 हुत्वान्येनान्येन धाक्षणाभोजयित्वा चरुं स्वयं प्राश्नीयात् । स
 योऽंतोऽधुतोऽगतोऽमतोऽनतोऽदृष्टोऽविज्ञातोऽनादिष्टः श्रोता
 मन्ता द्रष्टादेष्टा घोष्टा विज्ञाता प्रज्ञाता सर्वेषां भूतानामन्तर-
पुरुषः स म आत्मेति विद्यात् ॥४॥¹⁷

अथ खल्वियं सर्वस्यै वाच उपनिषत् । सर्वा ह्येवेमाः सर्वस्यै
 वाच उपनिषद्¹ इमां त्वेवाचक्षते । पृथिव्या रूपं स्पर्शा अन्त-
 रिक्षस्योष्माणो दिवः स्वराः । अग्ने रूपं स्पर्शा वायोऽहोष्माण
 आदित्यस्य स्वराः । ऋग्वेदस्य रूपं स्पर्शा यजुर्वेदस्योष्माणः²
 सामवेदस्य स्वराः । चक्षुषो रूपं स्पर्शाः श्रोत्रस्योष्माणो मनंसः
 स्वराः । प्राणस्य रूपं स्पर्शा अपानस्योष्माणो व्यानस्य स्वराः ।
 अथ खल्वियं देवी वीणा भवति तदनुकृतिरसौ मानुषी वीणा
 भवति । यथास्याः शिर एवममुष्याः शिरो यथास्या उदरमेव³

¹⁴ वराह—हन्ति om. F, which omits also दृक्षति—श्वायेत.

¹⁵ एनमा-स्कन्दति B. ¹⁶ वगिरति B. ¹⁷ रात्रिसूक्तेन B. ¹⁸ स यतः अधुतो B.

¹⁹ om. B. ²⁰ Numbered 10 in A, E, H, K, L; 10, 4 in F; 4, 10 in G;

4 in B, D.

¹ उपनिषद् B.

² वायोष्ण* F, G.

³ *आह B.

⁴ उदर B.

ममुष्या अम्भणं यथास्यै⁸ जिह्वैवममुष्यै वादनं यथास्यास्तन्त्रय
 एवममुष्या अद्गुलयो यथास्याः स्वरा एवममुष्याः स्वरा यथास्या
 स्पर्श एवममुष्या स्पर्श यथा ह्येवेयं शब्दवती तर्ध्ववत्येवमसौ
 शब्दवती तर्ध्ववती यथा ह्येवेयं लोमशेन चर्मणापिहिता भव-
 त्वेवमसौ लोमशेन⁷ चर्मणापिहिता⁹ । लोमशेन⁹ ह स्म⁹ वै
 चर्मणा पुरा⁷ वीणा अपिदधति । स यो हैतां देवीं¹⁰ वीणां वेद
 श्रुतवदनो भवति भूमिप्रास्य कीर्तिर्भवति यच्च क्र चार्या वाचो
 भाषन्ते विदुरेनं तच्च । अथातो वायसो यस्यां संसद्यधीयानो
 वा भाषमाणो वा न विरुचिषेत¹¹ तच्चेतामृचं जपेत् । ओष्ठा-
 पिधाना¹² नकुली दन्तैः परिवृता पविः । सर्वस्यै वाच ईशाना
 चारु मामिह वादयेत् । इति वायसः ॥५॥¹³

अथ हास्मा एतत्कृष्णहारितो चाग्भास्त्रणमिवोपोदाहरति ।
 प्रजापतिः प्रजाः सृष्ट्वा व्यसंस्त¹ संवत्सरः । स छन्दोभिरात्मानं
 समदधाद्यच्छन्दोभिरात्मानं समदधात्तस्मात्संहिता । तस्यै वा
 एतस्यै संहितायै एकारे बलं षकारः प्राण आत्मा । स यो
 हैतौ एकारषकारावनुसंहितमृचो वेद सबलां समाणां संहितां

⁸ यथा—लो lost in B

⁹ भवति—पिहिता om in K but add pr man.

⁷ लोमशेन—पुरा lost in B Here and above R has पिहिता ⁸ चर्मणा—

लोमशेन om G ⁹ ह स्म L ¹⁰ देवी B ¹¹ विरुचिषेत A F, G, K, L,

B S, विरुचिषेत B O, D, E, H ¹² This verse occurs also in the Sañti verses,

note on I 1 3, and see explanatory notes ¹³ Numbered 11 in A, E, H, K, L,

B 11 in F, G, 5 in B D

¹ व्यसंस्तदा संवत्सर B; प्रजाः E

वेदायुषमिति विद्यात् । ॥ यदि विचिकित्सेत्सण्कारं ब्रवाणी^३ ३^३
 अण्कारां^३ इति सण्कारमेव ब्रूयात्सषकारं ब्रवाणी^३ ३^३ अष-
 कारां^३ इति सषकारमेव ब्रूयात् । ते यदयमनुसंहितमृचो
 ऽधीमहे यच्च माण्डूकेयीयमध्यायं प्रब्रूमस्तेन नो ण्कारषकारा
 उपाप्नाविति ह स्माह ह्रस्वो माण्डूकेयः । अथ यदयमनुसंहित-
 मृचोऽधीमहे यच्च माण्डूकेयीयमध्यायं प्रब्रूमस्तेन नो ण्कार-
 षकारा उपाप्नाविति ह स्माह स्थविरः शाकल्यः [एतच्च स्म
 वै तद्विद्वांस आहुर्क्षयः कावपेयाः किमर्था वयमध्येष्मामहे
 किमर्था वयं यस्यामहे^४ वाचि हि प्राणं जुहुमः^५ प्राणे^६ वा
 वाचं यो^{१०} ह्येव प्रभवः स एवाप्ययः । ता एताः संहिता
 नानन्तेवासिने प्रब्रूयान्नासंवास्तरवासिने नाप्रवक्तु इत्याचार्या
 आचार्याः ॥ ६ ॥^{११}]

॥ इत्यैतरेयतृतीयारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥^{१२}

॥ इति तृतीयारण्यकं समाप्तम् ॥

^३ The arrangement of the *plais* is confirmed by the commentary. In ब्रवाणी^३ B omits the nasal ^३ Nasal om B ^४ माण्डूकेयूय B (perhaps for 'यी')

^५ 'संहिताम् B. ^६ उपाप्ना B, against the rule of Sandhi of the Āranyaka ^७ वयस्या-
 महे B ^८ जुहुमः B ^९ प्राणो—वाच B in text. ^{१०} चो K ^{११} Numbered ११

in A, E, H, K, L, 6, 12 in F, G, 6 in B, D ^{१२} इत्यैतरेयारण्यके तृतीयस्य तृतीयस्य
 तृतीयोऽध्यायः ॥ ३ ॥ इति तृतीयारण्यकं समाप्तम् A, where the error is worthy of note in
 view of the so-called Adhyāya in B. द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥ २ ॥ तृतीयारण्यकं समाप्तम् F, G;
 द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥ तृतीयारण्यः ॥ D. इति तृतीयारण्ये द्वितीयोऽध्यायः । समाप्तम् । K.
 इति तृतीयारण्यके द्वितीयाध्यायः । इति तृतीयारण्यके समाप्तम् । औ अथातः संहितायाः
 षट् । प्राणो षष्ठः षट् । अथातः हिताया अथ खल्वियं द्वौ । L, B has रत्नविदे
 संहितारण्ये द्वितीयोऽध्यायः । Then follows the third Adhyāya which is given in

the note on I, 1, 1. B has हरिः श्रीं । विदा मघवन् । अथ हाष्मा एतच्छ्रवहा-
 रितः । अथ खल्वियं सर्वस्य वाच उपनिषत् । दुग्धदोहा अस्व वेदा भवन्ति । चत्वारः
 पुरुषा इति बाध्वः । अथ कौण्डरव्यः । प्राणो वंश इति खविरः शाकल्यः । बृहद्रथ-
 नारयो ह्येष । अथ खल्वाङ्गनिर्मुञ्जवक्त्राः । अघातोऽनुव्याहाराः । अघातो निर्मुञ्जप्र-
 वादाः । अथ शाकल्यस्य । अघातसंहिताया उपनिषत् । अघातसंहिताष्टौ । प्राणो
 वंश इति षट् । अघातसंहिताया द्वादौ । इति तृतीयारणं समाप्तं । हरिः श्रीम् ।
 B has text with समाप्तः added

॥ अथ चतुर्थारण्यकम् ॥

वि॒दा^१ म॑घवन्वि॒दा गा॑तुमनुं शंसिषो दि॒शः ।
 शि॒क्षा श॑चीनां पते पूर्वी॒णां पु॑रुवसो ॥१॥
 आ॒भिष्टु॑म॒भिष्टि॑भिः प्रचे॒तन् प्र चे॑तय ।
 इन्द्र॑ द्युन्नाय॑ न इ॒म ए॒वा^२ हि श॒क्रः ॥२॥
 रा॒ये वा॒जाय॑ वज्रि॒वः श॑र्विष्ठ^३ वज्रि॒नृञ्जसे॑ ।
 म॑हिष्ठ वज्रि॒नृञ्जस॑ आ या॒हि पि॒व म॑त्स्व ॥३॥
 वि॒दा रा॒यः सु॒वीर्यं॑ भुवो वा॒जानां॑ पति॒र्वैशां॑ अ॒नु ।
 म॑हिष्ठ वज्रि॒नृञ्जसे॑ यः श॑र्विष्ठः पू॒राणाम् ॥४॥
 यो म॑हिष्ठो^४ म॒घोनां॑ चि॒कित्वो^५ अ॒भि नो॑ तय ।
 इन्द्रो॑ वि॒दे तमु॑ स्तुषे व॒शी हि श॒क्रः ॥५॥
 तमू॒तये॑ हवामहे जेता॒र्मप॑राजितम्^६ ।
 स नः॑ पर्ष॒दति॒ द्विषः^७ क्रतु॑च्छन्द॒ च्युतं॑ बृ॒हत् ॥६॥

^१ Accents do not appear in A D, F, G K, L, S. But the accents are undoubtedly old and the fact that the other verses cited in the book are not usually accented is not in point, since these are non Rgvedic verses. Similarly in Āranyaka V the non-Rgvedic verses are all accented. The motive is obvious, that the repeaters of the text should have guidance in repeating verses not from their own Samhitā.

^२ आविष् A, in R आ॒भिष्टु॑म. ^३ एव L. ^४ शर्विष्ठः R, dividing here the verse. ^५ चि॒कित्वो F. ^६ माहिष्ठो F. माहिष्ठो G. ^७ चि॒कित्वा L, चि॒कित्वः R. ^८ म॒पराजितम् L. ^९ द्विषत् G.

इन्द्रं धनस्य सातये हवामहे जेतामपराजितम् ।

स नः पर्यदति द्विषः स नः पर्यदति सिधः ॥७॥

पूर्वस्य यत्तं अद्रिवः सुख आ धेहि नो वसो ।

पूर्तिः शविष्ठ शस्यत¹⁶ ईशे हि शक्रः ॥८॥

नूनं तं नय्यं संन्यसे प्रभो जनस्य वृत्रहन् ।

समन्येषु ब्रवावहै शूरो यो¹⁷ गोषु गच्छति सखां सुशेवो
छद्मयाः ॥९॥

एवा ह्येवैवा ह्यग्रा¹² ॥ एवा ह्येवैवा हीन्द्रा¹³ ॥ एवा

ह्येवैवा हि विष्णा¹⁴ ॥ एवा ह्येवैवा हि पूषा¹⁵ ॥ एवा

ह्येवैवा हि देवा¹⁶ ॥१०॥ एवा हि शक्रो वशी हि शक्रो वशी¹⁷ ॥

अनु¹⁸ ॥ आ यो मन्याय मन्यव उपो मन्याय मन्यवे ॥ उपेहि

विश्वध¹⁹ ॥११॥ विदा मघवन्विदो²⁰ ॥

॥ इत्येतेर्यारण्यके चतुर्थारण्यं समाप्तम् ॥²¹

¹² अग्रत F . ¹³ यो om. L . ¹⁴ After अग्रा F has इन्द्र . एवा ह्येवैव द्वी¹⁵

एवा ह्येवैवा हि विष्णा¹⁶ ॥ G has इन्द्र . एवा ह्येवैवा ह्यग्रा इन्द्र . एवा ह्येवैवा
हि विष्णा¹⁷ ॥ B has हीन्द्रम् and so A, E, K, L, S has ही¹⁸ ॥ D only has
हीन्द्रा¹⁹ which must clearly be right . ²⁰ पूषन् A, D, E, F, G, K, पूष²¹ ॥ S

¹⁶ देवाः A, D, E, F, G, K, R. ¹⁷ वशी¹⁸ D, E, G H, L B, S . A and E have
the plus which is more likely to have been wrongly omitted than to have been inserted

¹⁹ विश्वध G. ²⁰ विदोम् D . ²¹ इत्येतेर्यारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः । इति
चतुर्थारण्यकं समाप्तम् । A : प्रथमोऽध्यायः । इति चतुर्थारण्यः । D, विदा मघवन्विदा
हरिः श्रीम् । इति चतुर्थारण्यं समाप्तम् । E, चतुर्थारण्यकं समाप्तम् । F, चतुर्थारण्यकं सं
(पूर्णम् in later hand), G, इति चतुर्थारण्यं प्रथमोऽध्यायः । समाप्तम् । K, इति
चतुर्थारण्यकं समाप्तम् । L.

॥ अथ पञ्चमारण्यकम् ॥ .

ADHYAYA 1.

महाव्रतस्य पञ्चविंशतिं सामिधेयः । एकविंशती प्रागुपो-
 त्तमायाः समिधामिमिति चतस्रः । वैश्वकर्मण कृषंभ उपाल-
 म्भनीय उपांशु । आज्यप्रउगे विश्वजितः । होचार्थतुर्विंशत् ।
 ईह्यन्तीरपस्युव इति च ब्राह्मणाच्छंस्यावपेत प्रातःसवने तीव्र-
 स्याभिवयसो अस्य पाहीति माध्यन्दिने । चिकटुकेषु महिषो
 यवाशिरमिति स्तोत्रियः । 'एन्द्र यात्युप नः परावत' इन्द्राय हि
 द्यौरसुरो^१ अनम्रत, 'प्रो ध्वस्मै पुरोरथमित्यतोऽनुरूपः । चतुर्विं-
 शन्मरुत्वतीयस्यात्तानोऽसत्तु मे जरितः साभिवेगः' 'पिवा
 सोममभि यमुय तर्दः' कया शुभा सवयसः सनीळा^२ मरुवाँ
 इन्द्र वृषभो रणाय, 'जनिष्ठा उयः सहसे तुरायेति मरुत्वतीयम् ।
 स्थिते मरुत्वतीये होता विसंस्थितसंचरेण निष्कन्त्याग्नीधीये
 तिस्र आज्याहुतीर्जुहोत्यौदुम्बरेण सुवेण ।

अनु मामिन्द्रो अनु मां बृहस्पतिरनु सोमो अनु वाग्देव्यावीत् ।
 अनु मां मित्रावरुणाविहावन्तामनु द्यावापृथिवी पूर्वहूतौ ॥
 आदित्या मा विश्वे अवन्तु देवाः सप्त राजानो य उताभिषिक्ताः ।
 वायुः पूषा वरुणः सोमो अग्निः सूर्यो नक्षत्रैरवत्विह मा नु ॥

^१ * वाग्—असुरो om. L. pr. man.
 for the 'उद्' of MSS. and edd.

^२ यमू देवाम् A

^३ So I read

पितरो मा विश्वमिदं च भूतं पृथिमातरो मस्तः स्वकाः ।

ये अग्निजिह्वा उत वा यजचास्ते नो देवाः सुहवाः शर्म यच्छतेति ॥

दक्षिणे मार्जालीये दश सुच्युत्तमां चतुर्गृहीतं पूर्वमवदायो-
त्तरतोऽग्रेरुपनिधाय विहरणप्रभृति मध्यन्दिने मार्जालीयो
जागरितो भवति तस्मिन्परिवृते जुहोति प्राग्द्वारे चोदग्द्वारे वा
प्रागुदग्द्वारे वा अग्निरिवानाधृष्यः पृथिवीव सुषदा भूयासम् ।
अन्तरिक्षमिवानाधृष्यो भूयासम् । सूर्य इवाप्रति-
धृष्यश्चन्द्रमा इव पुनर्भूर्भूयासम् । मन इवापूर्वं वायुरिव श्लोकभू-
र्भूयासम् । अहरिव स्वं रात्रिरिव प्रियो भूयासम् । गाव इव
पुनर्भुवो मिथुनमिव मरीचयो भूयासम् । आप इव रस
ओषधय इव रूपं भूयासम् । अन्नमिव विभु यज्ञ इव प्रभुर्भू-
यासम् । ब्रह्मेव लोके क्षत्रमिव श्रियां भूयासम् । यद्य एषा
समितिर्भवातीति । अथ विभजाय वीचेति वीचयनन्युचम् ।
अथ तिष्ठन्नादित्यमुपतिष्ठते पर्यावृत्ते प्रदक्षिणमावृत्त्येतैश्चैवा-
स्वाहाकारैरेत्येवा३ इदं मधू३ इदं मधु इमं तीव्रसुतं पिवा३
इदं मधू३ इदं मध्विति च । प्रेष्याः संशास्ति पूर्णकुम्भास्तिस्त्रो
ऽवमाः षष्ठुत्तमाः । इमं धिषण्यमुदकुम्भं च त्रिः प्रदक्षिणं
परिव्रजाय दक्षिणेः पाणिभिर्दक्षिणानूरूनांमाना एषेवा३ इदं
मधू३ इदं सध्विति वदत्यः ॥२॥

⁴ om B in text; it is in A, D, B, F, G, K, L, R in commentary, S add A ⁵ मधू३ om F (at end of a leaf). ⁶ ननु G. ⁷ The accents are

taken from E and R. R has चनु मा before बृहस्पतिः and चनु चागः also उत वा यजचास् and मा नु. If मानु is read, with Śrīyana, the accent must be altered. In देवाः सुहवाः there is probably a vocative, if not, the accent must be changed.

उपाकृते स्तोत्रे वैधं निनयाथाचोत्तरे च मार्जालीये शेषम-
न्तर्वेदीति । प्रदक्षिणमग्निं निष्क्रम्यायेण यूपं पुरस्तात्प्रत्यङ्मुख-
स्तिष्ठन्नग्नेः शिर उपतिष्ठते नमस्ते गायत्राय^१ यत्ते शिर इति ।
तेनैव यथेतं प्रत्येत्य दक्षिणमुदङ्मुखः पक्षं नमस्ते राधन्तराय
यस्ते दक्षिणः पक्ष इति । अपरेणाग्निपुच्छमतिक्रम्य प्राङ्मुख
उत्तरं नमस्ते बृहते यस्त उत्तरः पक्ष इति । पश्चात्प्राङ्मुखं
नमस्ते भद्राय यत्ते पुच्छ या ते प्रतिष्ठेति^२ । दक्षिणतः पुच्छस्या-
त्मानं^३ नमस्ते राजनाय यस्त आत्मेति ॥२॥

[यथेतं सदः प्रसर्पति । पुरस्तात्प्रेह उपकृप्तो भवति । स्थूणे
रज्जू वीवध इत्येतत्प्रक्षाल्य तीर्थेन प्रपाद्योत्तरेणाग्नीध्रीयं परि-
व्रज्य पूर्वया द्वारा सदः सर्वाग्निष्ण्यानुत्तरेण । औदुम्बराणि
काष्ठानि प्रेहस्य भवन्ति पालाशानि मिश्राणि वा । चीणि
फलकान्युभयतस्तण्डानि वे वा सूच्यथ तावत्यः] इष्टुमाचं
प्राङ्मेहो निमुष्टिकस्तिर्यङ्मुदगंयः^४ प्रागयाभ्यां सूचीभ्यां समुतः ।
दक्षिणोत्तरे स्थूणे निखामाभितो होतृषदनं^५ वीवधमत्यादधात्या-
स्यसमितं कर्तुः । कुष्ठासु छिद्राणि प्रेहस्य भवन्ति रज्जुभ्यामू-
र्ध्वमुद्वयति दक्षिणतो^६ दक्षिणयोत्तरतः सव्यया दार्भ्ये त्रिगुणे
स्यातां सव्यदक्षिणे पञ्चव्यायामे द्विगुणे वीवधे चिः प्रदक्षिणं
पर्यस्योर्ध्वमग्निं निष्टक्यं बभ्राति । शाखाभिर्बृसीभिर्वा पर्यृषन्त्य-

^१ गाय A. ^२ पुच्छ A. ^३ D omits the number and so reckons the following Khandas as nos 2 5 instead of 3-6

^४ भद्रग A. ^५ यय A. ^६ उपदन R in text ^७ om R in text.

प्रकम्पि । चतुरङ्गुलेनैष^१ विभूमः प्रेङ्गः स्यान्मुष्टिमात्रेण वा ।
दक्षिणत उदाहिततरः समो वा । पद्मात्रे धिष्यात् ॥३॥^२

निष्ठिते प्रेङ्गे होता वाणमौदुम्बरं शततन्तुमुभाभ्यां परिगृ-
ह्योत्तरत उपोहते यथा वीणाम् । सप्तभिर्छन्दोभिश्चतुस्तैः
स्थानान्यस्योर्ध्वमुद्गृह्णीयाद्दशभिर्वा । गायत्रेण त्वा छन्दसोद्ग्रा-
म्यौष्णिहेन त्वानुष्टुभेन त्वा वार्हतेन त्वा पाङ्केन त्वा वैष्टुभेन त्वा
जागतेन त्वा विराजेन त्वा वैपदेन त्वातिछन्दसा त्वेति । छन्दा-
स्यनुक्रम्य स्थानानामनुपरिक्रमणमौदुम्बर्याद्र्या शाखया सप्तला-
शया मूलदेशेन वाणं चिरूर्ध्वमुत्तिष्ठति । प्राणाय त्वापानाय
त्वा ध्यानाय त्वोत्तिष्ठामीति । अन्येभ्योऽपि कामेभ्यः पुनरपि
न तूत्तिष्ठामीति ब्रूयात् । अथैनं सशाखं छन्दोगेभ्यः प्रयच्छति ।
भूतेभ्यस्त्वेति पञ्चाद्वै फलके पाणी प्रतिष्ठापयति प्राणमनुप्रे-
ङ्गस्त्वेति प्राञ्चं प्रेङ्गं प्रणयेति ध्यानमनुवीहस्त्वेति तिर्यञ्चमपा-
नमन्वीहस्त्वेत्यभ्यात्मम् । भूर्भुवः स्वरिति जपति । प्राणाय त्वेति
प्राञ्चमेव ध्यानाय त्वेति तिर्यञ्चमपानाय त्वेत्यभ्यात्मम् । वस-
वस्त्वा गायत्रेण छन्दसारोहन्तु तानन्वारोहामीति पञ्चाद्वै फलके
ऽरुनी प्रतिष्ठापयति । अथ पूर्वं फलकं नाना पाणिभ्यामभिपद्येत
यथाहिः^३ सप्तस्यन् । मध्यमं छुबुकेनोपस्पृशेद्द्वयोर्वा संधिम्^४ ।
रुद्रास्त्वा वैष्टुभेन छन्दसारोहन्तु तानन्वारोहामीति दक्षिणं^५
सकथ्यतिहरति । आदित्यास्त्वा जागतेन छन्दसारोहन्तु तानन्वा-

^१ दृष्टेन A.^२ Numbered 3 in D^३ न्योः S ^४ यथाहि A, D, E, K, L. यथा हि B; थाहि P, G. ^५ संधि A.^६ दक्षिणं—इति cum A

रोहामीति' सव्यम् । विश्वे त्वा देवा आनुष्टुभेन^१ छन्दसारोहन्तु
तानन्वारोहामीति समारोहति पश्चात्स्वस्य धिष्ण्यस्य दक्षिणं
पादं प्राञ्चं प्रतिष्ठापयन्त्यथ सव्यं यदेतरः^२ आम्बेदथेतरं यदेतरो
ऽथेतरं । नोभौ विभूमौ कुर्यात् । कूर्चान्होत्रकाः समारोहन्ति
ब्रह्मा चौदुस्ररीमासन्दीमुद्गाता । यदि कस्मैचिदवश्यकर्मणे'
जिगमिषेदादिश्य पालं प्राङ्बुरुह्य' चरित्वा तमर्धमेवमेवाज-
पयावृतारोहेत् ॥४॥'

प्रस्तोतारं संशस्ति पञ्चविंशस्य स्तोमस्य तिसृष्वर्धतृतीया-
स्वर्धत्रयोदशासु वा परिशिष्टासु प्रथमं प्रतिहारं प्रवृत्तादिति ।
अर्धत्रयोदशासु प्रवाचयतेति^३ जातूकर्ण्यः । प्रोक्ते जपति ।
सुपर्णोऽसि गरुत्मान्प्रेमां वाचं वदिष्यामि बहु वदिष्यन्तीं बहु
'पतिष्यन्तीं' बहु करिष्यन्तीं बहु सनिष्यन्तीं बहोर्भूयः करिष्यन्तीं
स्वर्गंछन्तीं स्वर्वदिष्यन्तीं स्वः पतिष्यन्तीं स्वः करिष्यन्तीं स्वः
सनिष्यन्तीं स्वरिमं यज्ञं वक्ष्यन्तीं स्वर्मा यजमानं वक्ष्यन्ती-
मिति । दीक्षिते यजमानशब्दो नादीक्षिते । स्वरमुर्मिति यो
ऽस्य प्रियः स्यान्न तु वक्ष्यन्तीमिति ब्रूयात् । उक्थयवीर्याणि
च । सं प्राणो वाचा समहं वाचा सं चक्षुर्मनसा समहं मनसा
सं श्रोत्रमात्मना समहमात्मना मयि महान्मयि भर्गो मयि
भगो मयि भुजो मयि स्तोभो मयि स्तोमो मयि^४ द्योको मयि

^१ अनुष्टुभेन G ^२ यदेतर K, L, यदेत F, G, यदेतर R in text ^३ कर्मिणे
D sec. man, F, G, K, L, श्रो ॥ ^४ प्राङ्बुरुह्य F, G ^५ Numbered 3 in D
^६ वाचयति F. ^७ स्वर्गंछन्ती om A ^८ स्वर्वदिष्यन्ती om. D, E, S¹⁻³.
^९ स्वर G ^{१०} मयि श्लोको om F

घोषो मयि यशो मयि श्रीर्मयि कीर्तिर्मयि भुक्तिरिति । आहूय
वागिति जपति । त्रय आहावाः शस्त्रादेर्निविदः परिधानीयाया
इति । शब्दानन्वयवः कारयन्ति* । एतस्मिन्नहनि प्रभूतमन्नं
दद्यात् । राजपुत्रेण चर्म व्याधयन्त्याग्नन्ति भूमिदुन्दुभिं पत्न्यश्च
काण्डवीणा भूतानां ज्ञ मैथुनं ब्रह्मचारिपुंश्चल्योः संप्रवादो
ऽनेकेन साक्षा निष्केवल्याय स्तुवते राजनस्तीक्ष्णयेण प्रति-
पद्यते ॥५॥[†]

तदिदास भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठं तां सु ते कीर्तिं मघवन्महत्वा भूय
इष्टावृधे वीर्याय । नृणामु त्वा नृतमं गीर्भिरुक्थैरिति तिस्रः ।
अथ हैके स्वादोः स्वादीयः स्वादुना सृजा समदः सु मधुः
मधुनाभि योधीरित्यात्मनः एते पदे उद्धृत्य पक्षपदे^३ प्रत्यवद-
धात्यश्वायन्तो मघवन्निन्द्र वाजिनो गामश्च रथ्यमिन्द्र सं किरे-
त्येतयोश्च स्थान इतरे । श्रियमह गोरश्चमात्मन्धत्ते सं पक्षयोः^४
पतनाय । नदं व ओदतीनामित्येतयेतानि व्यतिपजति पादेः
पादान्बृहतीकारं नदंवन्युत्तराणि प्रथमायां च पुरुषाक्षराण्युप-
दधाति पादेष्वेकैकमवसाने नृतीयवर्जं स खलु विहरति । अपि
निदर्शनायोदाहरिष्यामः । तदिदास भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठं पु । नदं
व ओदतीनाम्^५ । यतो जज्ञ उयस्त्वेधनृम्णो रु । नदं यो-
युवतीनोऽम्^६ ॥ सद्यो जज्ञानो नि रिणाति शत्रून् । पतिं वो

* करयन्ति F.

† Numbered 4 in D.

१ सुमधुना only. A.

२ दाना F, G.

३ पक्ष om. A.

४ रथमम् K.

R in text

५ संपत्तियोः F.

६ ओदतीनाम् A, E, K, L, R, S; ०नाऽम् D, F, G.

७ युवतीनोम् K; युवतीनाम् E, L; युवतीनाऽम् F, D pr. man. corrected sec. man
to युवतीनोऽम्; text, A, G, R, S (युवतीनो in text).

अध्यानाम्¹ । अनु² यं विश्वे मदन्त्युमाः यो । धेनूनामिषुध्य-
सोऽमिति ॥ एवमेतां त्रिः । अन्यासु चेत्समाम्नातासु राजनेन
साम्ना स्तुवीरन्यथास्थानं ता इहैवेमाः । असमाम्नातासु चेत्स्तु-
वीरन्समाम्नातस्य³ तावतीरुद्धृत्य तत्र ताः शंसेदिहो एवेमाः ।
अन्यासु चेत्प्राक्सूददोहसस्ताः । तदिदासेत्येतदादि शस्त्रम् ।
अविहृतश्चात्र प्रतिगरः । ता अस्य सूददोहस इत्येतदादिः
सूददोहाः सूददोहाः ॥ ६ ॥¹³

॥ इत्यैतरेयपञ्चमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥¹⁴

ADHYAIA 2

यीवाः । यस्येदमारजस्तुजो युजो वनं सहः । इन्द्रस्य रन्यं
बृहत् ॥ नाधृष आ दधर्ष दाधृषाण¹ धृषितं शर्वः । पुरा यदीमति
व्यधिरिन्द्रस्य धृषितं सहः ॥ स नो ददातु तं रुयिं रुयिं² पिश-
ङ्गसंदृशम् । इन्द्रः पतिस्त्वत्समो जनेष्वा ॥ सूददोहाः । शिरो
गायत्रिमिन्द्रमिज्ञाधिनो बृहदिति । अन्यासु चेत्समाम्नातासु
स्तुवीरन्नुभया³ संस्थानविपर्ययोऽसमाम्नातासु चेत्स्तुवीरन्मि-
थासु च । सूक्तस्योक्तमा सूददोहाः । विज्रवः । सुतस्ते सोम-

¹ अध्यानाम् A अध्रियानाम् F अध्याऽनाम् D (3 add see man) अध्यानाम्
K L M S एनाऽम् F G ² अनु A ¹⁰ मियुध्यसोम् D F G K L S
¹¹ समाम्नातवतीर F ¹² शंसेह A ¹³ Numbered 5 in D ¹⁴ Text
A B इति प्रथमोऽध्याय D पचमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्याय F G इति पचम आरण्ये
प्रथमोऽध्याय K इति पचमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्याय L no colophon E R accents
quite irregularly the words of the first two sentences Cf V 2 2

¹ दाधृषाणा G दार्धषाण L ² om F G ³ See explanatory notes

उप याहि यज्ञं मन्स्वा मदं पुरु वारं मधाय । मंहिष्ठ इन्द्र
विजरो^१ गृण्यै ॥ स साहर्तुर्वृत्रहत्येषु शत्रून्भुविगाह एषः ।
स नो^२ नेतारं महयाम् इन्द्रम् ॥ इनो वसुः^३ समञः पर्वतेष्टाः
प्रति वामृजीषी । इन्द्रः शश्वद्भिर्जोहूच एवैः ॥ सूददोहाः । इत्ये-
तत्तयं यीवाः शिरो विजवः सर्वमर्धर्चम्^४ ॥१॥

राघन्तरो दक्षिणः पक्षः । अभि त्वा पूर नोनुमोऽभि त्वा
पूर्वपीतय इति राघन्तरस्य स्तोत्रियानुरूपौ प्रगाथौ चतस्रः
सतीः षडुहतीः करोति । इन्द्रस्य नु वीर्याणि प्रवोचं त्वे ह
यत्पितरश्चिन्न इन्द्रेति पञ्चदश यस्तिग्मशृङ्गो वृषभो न भीम
उग्रो जज्ञे वीर्याय स्वधावानुदु घृष्टाण्यैरत श्रवस्याते मह
इन्द्रोऽत्युपेति पञ्च सूक्तानि । आ न इन्द्रो दूरादा न आसादिति
संपातः । इत्या हि सोम इन्मद इति पङ्क्तिः । सूददोहाः । बार्हत
उत्तरः । त्वामिच्छि हवामहे त्वं ह्येहि चेरव इति बृहतः स्तोत्रि-
यानुरूपौ प्रगाथौ । चतस्रः^५ सतीः षडुहतीः करोति । तमु
ष्टुहि यो अभिभूत्योजाः सुत इत्वं निमिष्य इन्द्र सोम इति
चीरणभूरेको रयिपते रयीणामित्यष्टौ सूक्तानि । कथा महामवृ-
धत्कस्य होतुरिति संपातः । इन्द्रो मदाय वावृध इति पङ्क्तिः ।

^१ नोतार A ^२ वसु R in text and commentary, but the commentary clearly had
वसुः. ^३ मर्धर्चम् F, || ^४ Numbered 7 in A, E, K, L, 1, 7 in F, G,

1 in D In R, besides several omitted accents, there occur वृहत्, धृषितं, ददात्,
सुतम्, मंहिष्ठ, साहर्तुर्वृत्रहत्येषु शत्रून्, एषः, पर्वतेष्टाः, वीषी. यीवाः 3 has the plus,
as in V, 3, 1

^५ चस्रः F.

सूददोहाः । राथन्तरो दक्षिणः पक्षः पञ्चदशस्तोम^१ एकशतं
वसिष्ठप्रासाहो बार्हत उत्तरः सप्तदशस्तोमो^२ द्विशतं भरद्वाज-
प्रासाहः । भद्रं पुष्टं द्विपदासु । इमा नु कं भुवना सीपधामा
याहि वनसा सहेति नव समाम्नाताः । अयासमाम्नाताः ।

प्र व इन्द्राय युवहन्तामाय विप्रा गाथं गायत यज्जुजोषत् ॥ १ ॥

अर्चन्त्यर्कं देवताः स्वर्का आस्तोभति श्रुतो^३ युवा स इन्द्रः ॥ २ ॥

उप प्रक्षे^४ मधुमति^५ क्षियन्तः^६ पुष्यन्तो रयिं धीमहे तमिन्द्र ॥ ३ ॥

विश्वतो दावन्विश्वतो न^७ आ भर यं त्वा शर्विष्ठमीमहे ॥ ४ ॥

स सुप्रणीति नृतमः स्वराळसि मंहिष्ठो बार्जसातये ॥ ५ ॥

त्वं ह्येक ईशिषे सनादमृक्त ओजसा ॥ ६ ॥

विश्वस्य प्र स्तोभ विद्वान्पुरा वा यदि वेहासं नूनम् ॥ ७ ॥

इयं नो मिवावरुणा कर्तनेकां पीवरीमियं कृणुही न इन्द्र ॥ ८ ॥

शं पदं मयं रयिषणि^८ न सोमो अव्रतं हिनोति न स्पृशद्दृयिः ॥ ९ ॥

• एष ब्रह्मेति तिस्रः आ धूर्ष्वस्मा इत्येका । सूददोहाः । यदा-
वानेति धाय्या । सूददोहाः ॥ २ ॥^{११}

गायत्री तृचाशीतिः । महौ इन्द्रो य ओजसेति तिस्र उत्तमा
उद्धरति । पुरोळाशं नो अन्धस इति तिस्रः । इन्द्र इत्तोमपा

^१ दशः in both cases S, 'स्तोमो' ■ ^२ See explanatory notes ^३ श्रुते G,
see explanatory notes ^४ उपप्रवे R, see explanatory notes ^५ मति A

^६ क्षियन्तः G ^७ न om G ^८ रयिषां F, G ^९ रयिषणि F, G, R in
commentary ^{११} Numbered 8 in A B K, L, 2, 8 in F, G, 2 in D. R has

the following incorrect accents besides accenting प्रयायी—प्रयोष, मायत, तास्वर्का,
स्तीमति श्रुतो, शृष्टर्चिः, विश्वस्य.

एक इत्येतत्प्रभृतीनां तिस्र उक्तमा उद्धरति । तासां स्वादवः
सोमा आ याहीत्येतामुद्धृत्य न ह्यन्यं वळाकरमित्येतां प्रत्यवद-
धाति । जज्ञानो नु शतक्रतुरित्येका । पुरुहूतं पुरुष्टुतमिति शेषः ।
उद्धेदभि श्रुतामघमित्युक्तमामुद्धरति । प्र कृतान्यृजीषिण आ घा
ये अग्निमिन्धत आ नू न इन्द्र क्षुमन्तमिति सूक्ते । सूद-
दोहाः ॥३॥^१

वाहती नृचाशीतिः । मा चिदन्यद्वि शंसतेत्येकया न विंशत् ।
पिवा सुतस्य रसिन इति विंशतेः^२ सप्तमीं चाष्टमीं चोद्धरति ।
यदिन्द्र प्रागघागुदगिति चतुर्दश । वयं घ त्वा सुतावन्त इति
पञ्चदश^३ । सो घु त्वा वाघतश्चनेत्येतस्य द्विपदां चोद्धरति^४
राथन्तरं च प्रगाथम् । अथ हास्य न किः सुदासो रथमित्येतं
प्रगाथमुद्धृत्य त्वामिदा ह्यो नर इत्येतं प्रगाथं प्रत्यवदधाति ।
अभि प्र वः सुराधसमिति षड्वालखिल्यानां सूक्तानि । यः
सचाहा विचर्पणिरिति शेषः । अयं ते अस्तु हर्यत^५ इति सूक्ते ।
उभयं षृणवच्च न इति सप्तमीं चाष्टमीं चोद्धरति । तरोभिर्वा
विदद्वसुमित्युक्तमामुद्धरति । यो राजा चर्पणोनामित्येकादश । तं
वो दस्ममृतीपहमा नो विश्वासु हव्यो या इन्द्र भुज क्षाभर इति
नव । सूददोहाः ॥४॥^६

^१ Numbered 9 in A, E, K, L; 2, 9 in F; 3, 9 in G; 3 in D.

^२ विंशसते इत् R in text; विंशसतेकया L. In a note to the commentary R gives एकोनविंशत as a variant.

^३ विंशते L.

^४ यदिन्द्र—उद्धरति lit O.

^५ पंचद A.

^६ अस्तुर्यत F.

^७ Numbered 10 in A, E, K, L; 4, 10 in F, G;
4 in D.

औष्णिहो नृचाशीतिः । य इन्द्र सोमपातम इति सूक्ते । तम्बभि प्र गायतेत्युत्तमामुद्धरति¹ । इन्द्राय साम गायत सखाय आ शिषामहीति तिस्र उत्तमा उद्धरति । य एक इद्विदयत आ याह्यद्रिभिः सुतं यस्य त्यच्छ्वरं मद² इति त्रयस्तृचा गायत्र्यः संपदोष्णिहः सप्त सप्त गायत्र्यः षट्कुष्णिहो भवन्ति । यदिन्द्राहं यथा त्वं प्र सम्राजं चर्षणीनामिति सूक्ते । उत्तरस्योत्तमे उद्धरति । वार्चहत्याय शवस इत्युत्तमामुद्धरति । सुरुपकृन्तुमूतय इति चीणि । एन्द्रसानसिं रयिमिति सूक्ते । य ज्ञानयात्परावत इति तिस्र उत्तमा उद्धरति । रेवतीर्नः सधमाद इति तिस्रः । सूददोहाः । इत्येतास्त्रिसस्तृचाशीतयः 'सर्वा अर्धर्च्याः' । अन्नमशीतयः । उदरं वशः । त्वावतः पुरुवसविति वशः । सनितः सुसनितरित्येतदन्तः । ददो रेक्ण इति द्विपदा । नूनम-
थेत्येकपदा । ता अस्य सूददोहस इत्येतदन्तः सूददोहाः सूद-
दोहाः ॥ ५ ॥³

॥ इत्यैतरेयपञ्चमारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥⁴

¹ मुद्धरति F. ² मह K ³ R joins इति with सूददोहा, against the commentary and the sense

⁴ अर्धर्च्याः G, अर्धर्चाः D pr man, corrected to
*इयाः ⁵ Numbered 11 in A, F, K, L, 5, 11 in F, G, 5 in D ⁶ इत्यैतरे-

यपञ्चमारण्ये द्वितीयोऽध्यायः A, इत्यैतरेयारण्यके पञ्चमारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः B,
पञ्चमारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः F, G, इति पञ्चम आरण्ये द्वितीयोऽध्यायः K, इति
पञ्चमारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः L; इति द्वितीय D, no colophon E

ADHYAYA 3.

ऊरु' । इन्द्राग्नी युवं सु न इत्येतस्यार्धर्चान्गायत्रीकारमुत्तर-
 रमुत्तरस्यानुष्टुप्कारं प्रागुत्तमायाः । प्र वो महे मन्दमानायान्यस
 इति निविद्यानम् । वने न वा यो न्यधायि चाकन्यो जात एव
 प्रथमो मनस्वानिति ते अन्तरेणा याह्यर्वाङ्गुप बन्धुरेष्टा विधुं
 दद्राणं समने बहूनामित्येतदावपनम् । दशतीनामैन्द्रीणां चि-
 पुञ्जगतीनां बृहतीसंपन्नानां यावतीरावपेरस्तावन्त्यूर्ध्वमायुषी
 वर्षाणि जिजीविषेत्संवत्सरात्संवत्सराद्दशतो न वा । त्वमू घु
 वाजिनं देवजूतम् । इन्द्रो विश्वं वि राजतीत्येकपदा । इन्द्रं
 विश्वा अवीवृधन्वित्यानुष्टुभम् । तस्य प्रथमायाः पूर्वमर्धर्चं
 शस्वोत्तरेणार्धर्चंनोत्तरस्याः पूर्वमर्धर्चं व्यतिषजति पादैः पादा-
 ननुष्टुप्कारम् । प्रागुत्तमायाः पूर्वस्मात्पूर्वस्मादर्धर्चादुत्तरमुत्तर-
 मर्धर्चं व्यतिषजति । प्रकृत्या शेषः । पिबा सोममिन्द्र मन्दतु
 त्वेति षट् । योनिष्ट इन्द्र सद्ने शकारीत्येतस्य चतस्रः शस्वोत्तमा-
 सुपसंतत्योपोत्तमया¹ परिदधाति । परिहित उक्थ² उक्थसंपदं
 जपति । उक्थवीर्यस्य स्थान उक्थदोहः ॥ १ ॥

¹ ऊरुः B in text and in commentary. But Sāyaṇi does not note the *plati*, and probably it is incorrect. Neither B nor the MSS. have it. Cf. on V, 2, 1. ² जिजी-
 विषत् G.

³ पादानुष्टुप् D pr. man., F, G; पादानानुष्टुप् D sec. man.

⁴ पोत्तमाया T, G.

⁵ am. F, G.

⁶ Numbered 12 in A, E, K, L; 1, 12 in

F, G; 1 in D.

मूर्धा लोकानामसि वाचो रस्स्तेजः प्राणस्यायतनं मनसः ।
 संवेशश्चक्षुषः संभवः श्रोत्रस्य प्रतिष्ठा हृदयस्य सर्वम् ॥१॥^१
 इन्द्रः कर्मोक्षितममृतं व्योम चतुतं सत्यं विजिग्यानं विवाचनम् ।
 अन्तो वाचो विभुः सर्वस्मादुत्तरं ज्योतिरूधरप्रतिवादः पूर्वम् ॥२॥
 सर्वं वाक्परागवाक्सप्तं सलिलं धेनु पिबति चक्षुः श्रोत्रं प्राणः ।
 सत्यसमितं वाक्प्रभूतं मनसो विभूतं हृदयोयं ब्राह्मणभर्तृ-
 कम् ॥३॥

अन्नशुभे वर्षपवित्रं गोभगं पृथिव्युपरं वरुणवाय्वितमम् ।
 तपस्त्विन्द्रज्येष्ठं सहसंधारममुताक्षरममृतं दुर्हानम् ॥४॥
 एतास्त उक्थ भूतय एता वाचो विभूतयः ।
 तानिर्म इह धुस्वामृतस्य श्रियं महीम् ॥५॥
 प्रजापतिरिदं ब्रह्म वेदानां ससृजे रसम् ।
 तेनाहं विश्वमायासं सर्वान्कामान्दुहां मूहत् ॥६॥

भूर्भुवः स्वस्त्रयो वेदोऽसि । ब्रह्म प्रजां मे धुस्व । आयुः
 प्राणं मे धुस्व । पशून्विशं मे धुस्व । श्रियं यशो मे धुस्व ।
 लोकं ब्रह्मवर्चसमभयं यज्ञसमृद्धिं मे धुस्व । इति वाचयत्यध-
 र्युमबुद्धं^२ चेदस्य भवति । ओमुक्थशा यज सोमस्येतीज्यायै संप्रे-
 षितो ये^३ यजामह इत्यागूर्य नित्ययैव यजति ब्यवान्येवानु-

^१ The verses are divided as prose in the MSS, H and S, see explanatory notes

^२ 'मर्तुम्' S ^३ 'वध्व' A, H, S, in consequence, no doubt of the following: 'वाय्वि' being written = 'वध्वि' ^४ विश्वमायास A ^५ 'ममुद्' A, 'ममुद् (?)' I

^६ ३ om S, but the uno in the phrase is constant, and = laid down in Aitareya Srauta Sutra, I, 5 5

वषट्परोति । उक्तं वषट्कारानुमन्त्रणम् । आहरत्यध्वर्युस्त्वथपा-
चमतिपाद्यांश्चमसांश्च⁷ । भक्षं प्रतिख्याय होता प्राङ्मेक्षादव-
रोहति । अथैतं प्रेक्षं प्रत्यञ्चमववधन्ति यथा शंसितारं भक्षयि-
ष्यन्तं नोपहनिष्यसीति । प्रेक्षस्य ह्यायतन⁸ आसीनो होता
भक्षयति । अथैतदुक्थपाचं होतोपसृष्टेन जपेन भक्षयति ।
वाग्देवी सोमस्य नृप्यतु । सोमो मे राजायुः प्राणाय वर्षतु ।
स मे प्राणः सर्वमायुर्दुहां महदिति । उन्नमादाभिन्नविकानृती-
यसवनमन्यद्वैश्वदेवान्निविद्यानादस्य वामस्य पलितस्य होतुरिति
सलिलस्य दीर्घतमस एकचत्वारिंशतमानोभद्रीयं⁹ च तस्य स्थान
ऐकाहिकी वैश्वदेवस्य प्रतिपदनुचरौ । अथैत चेद्यज्ञायज्ञीयमग्ने
तव श्रवो वय इति षट्कोचियानुरूपौ यदीळान्दं भूयसीषु
चेत्स्तुवीरन्नाग्निं न स्ववृक्तिभिरिति तावतीरनुरूपः । संपन्नं
महाव्रतं संतिष्ठत इदमहरग्निष्टोमो यथाकालमवभृथं प्रेक्षं हरेयुः
संदहेयुर्वृसीः ॥२॥¹⁰

⁷ चमसं F.⁸ अतनमासीनो S.⁹ आनोभद्वियं O¹⁰ Numbered 13 in A, E, K, L, 2, 13 in F, G; 2 in D

E omits accents, and it has the accents in many cases obviously wrong. In the case of the double accent of compounds, some of these may be correct; similar instances—some clearly wrong—occur, however, in the Kashmir MS of the Khilas of the R̥gveda, as Schoffelewits (p. 39) points out. The chief cases are, v. 1, वाचो, हृदयस्य सर्वं; v. 2, इन्द्रः कुमार्चितममृतं, वाचो; v. 3, सर्वं, पिबति, वाक्प्रभृतं, हृदयोचं, प्राङ्मणभृतं; v. 4, वर्षपवित्रं, पृथिव्युषरं, तपस्विन्द्रज्वेष्टं, मयुताचरमः; v. 6, वेदानां सखं, तेनाहं विद्वामापांसं सर्वान्कामान्दुहां; v. 7, स्वस् and ब्रह्मवर्चसं. पिशं मे and यशो मे are conceivable but improbable.

नादीक्षितो महाव्रतं शंसेन्नानमौ न परस्मै नासंवत्सरं
 इत्येके कामं पित्रे वाचार्याय वा शंसेदात्मनो हैवास्य तच्छस्त्रं
 भवति । होतृशस्त्रेषूक्यशा^१ यजं सोमस्येत्येकः प्रियः संताराशं-
 सेष्वनाराशंसेषु वा होवकाणाम् । [उक्यशा^२ यज सोमाना-
 मिति ।] तदिदमहर्नानन्तेवासिने प्रवूयान्नासंवत्सरवासिने नो
 एवासंवत्सरवासिने नाग्रसंचारिणे नासव्रसंचारिणे नो एवा-
 सव्रसंचारिणे नानभिप्राप्तायैतं देशम् । न भूयः सकृद्दत्ताङ्गिर्ग-
 दत्ताद्वा द्वयमेव । एक एकस्मै प्रवूयादिति ह स्माह जातूकर्ण्यः ।
 न वत्से च न तृतीय इति । न तिष्ठंस्तिष्ठते न व्रजं व्रजते न
 शयानः शयानाय नोपर्यासीन उपर्यासीनायाध एवासीनोऽध
 आसीनाय । नावष्टब्धो न प्रतिस्तब्धो नातिवीतो नाङ्कः कृत्वो-
 ध्वंश्चुरनपश्चितोऽधीयीत न मांसं भुक्त्वा न लोहितं दृष्ट्वा न
 गतासुं नाग्रत्यमाक्रम्य नाङ्का नाभ्यज्य नोन्मर्दनं कारयित्वा न
 नापितेन कारयित्वा न स्नात्वा न वर्णकेनानुलिप्य न स्रजम-
 पिनक्ष न स्त्रियमुपगम्य नोल्लिख्य नाविलिख्य । नेदमेकस्मि-
 न्नहनि समापयेदिति ह स्माह जातूकर्ण्यः समापयेदिति गालवो
 यदन्यत्प्राकृचाशीतिभ्यः^३ समापयेदेवेत्याग्निवेश्यायनोऽन्यमन्य-
 स्मिन्देष्टे शमयमान इति । यचेदमधीयीत न तचान्यदधीयीत
 यच्च त्वन्यदधीयीत काममिदं तचाधीयीत । नेदमनधीयन्त्वातको
 भवति यद्यप्यन्यद्वधीयान्वेदमनधीयन्त्वातको भवति । ना-

^१ This sentence is of doubtful authenticity, see explanatory notes

^२ स नरा ३.

^३ This occurs in all the MSS. of the text, but was clearly not read by Śāṅga, and occurs in none of the MSS. of Śāṅga

स्मादधीतात्ममाद्येद्यप्यन्यस्मात्प्रमाद्येनैवास्मात्प्रमाद्येनो एवा-
 स्मात्प्रमाद्येत् । अस्माच्चेन्न प्रमाद्येदलमात्मन इति विद्यात् ।
 अलं सत्यं विद्यात् । नेदंविदन्तिदंविदा समुद्दिशेन्न सह-भुञ्जीत
 न सधमादी स्यात् । अथातः स्वाध्यायधर्मं व्याख्यास्यामः ।
 उप पुराणेनापीते कक्षोदके पूर्वाह्णे न संभिन्नासु छायास्व-
 पराह्णे नाध्यूह्य मेघेऽपतौ वर्षे चिराच्च वैदिकेनाध्यायेनान्त-
 रियान्नास्मिन्कथां वदेत् नास्य रात्रौ चन चिकीर्तयिषेत् ।
 तदिति वा एतस्य महतो भूतस्य नाम भवति योऽस्यैतदेवं
 नाम वेद ब्रह्म भवति ब्रह्म भवति ॥ ३॥^६

॥ इत्यितरेयमञ्चमारण्यके तृतीयोऽध्यायः ॥^७

॥ इति पञ्चमारण्यकं समाप्तम् ॥^८

^६ So I conjecture: च कीर्तयिषेत् all MSS. and odd. ^७ Numbered 14 in A, E, K, L; 3, 14 in F, G; not numbered in D. ^८ Text, A, R; तृतीयोऽध्यायः पञ्चमारण्यक-
 मारण्यं (मारण्य G) पञ्चमारण्यकपर्यन्तं । अष्टादशोऽध्यायः । ओं (om. G) इति आन्त्रजा-
 यनोत्तरमारण्यकं नाम समाप्तं । F, G; इति पञ्चम आरण्ये तृतीयोऽध्यायः । समाप्तं ।
 K; इति पञ्चमारण्यके । तृतीयोऽध्यायः । इति पञ्चमारण्यकं समाप्तं । L; इति तृतीयो
 अध्यायः । इति पञ्चमारण्यः । समाप्तः । D D has ३४ हरिः ओं । अपिर्धे देवानां-
 मवमो विष्णुः परमः (the beginning of the Atareya Brāhmana, which presumably once
 in this MS followed the Āraṇyaka) । नादीचितो महाव्रतं शंसेत् । सूर्वा लोकागामसि ।
 ऊरु इन्द्रापी युवं मु न इति । श्रीणिही नृचाशीतिः । बार्हती नृचाशीतिः । गायत्री
 नृचाशीतिः । राघवन्तरो दक्षिणः पयः । गीवाः यक्षेदमारजः । तदिदास भुवनेषु ष्वेष्टं तं
 मु ते कीर्ति मधवमहिला । प्रक्षोतारं संशास्ति । निधिते प्रेङ्गे होता । यथेत् सदः
 प्रसर्पति । उपास्ति स्तोत्रे । महाव्रतस्य पञ्चविंशतिं शमिधेयः । महाव्रतस्य पट् ।
 शीयाः सप्त । ऊरु त्रयः । महाव्रतस्य श्रीणिही चत्वारि । इति पञ्चमारण्यं समाप्तम् ।
 आरण्यपञ्चकं समाप्तम् । हरिः ओम् । See also the note on I, 1, 1. K sums up

the number of Khandas thus. खड्ग ३५ म २२ द्वि २६ तृ १२ च १ प १४ । At the end of the Āranyaka S adds a second set of Sānti Mantras, see on I, 1, 1. Similarly in the Anandasrama edition, 1895, of thirty two Upanisads there is prefixed to the Kausitaki Upanisad, and also appended to it, a set of Sānti Mantras, similar to those in Aitareya Āranyaka, II, 7, and Sāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, VII, 1.

AITAREYA ĀRANYAKA

TRANSLATION AND NOTES

ĀRANYAKA I

ADHYĀTA 1.

Now begins the Mahāvratā¹ rite. Indra having slain Vṛtra became great. When he became great, then there came into being the Mahāvratā. Therefore the Mahāvratā ceremony bears the name of Mahāvratā. Some² say the priest should make two recitations with the ghee-offering for that day, but the established rule is one. He who desires prosperity should use the hymn, 'To Agni, to this god of yours, (I sing aloud)' (RV., III, 13). He who desires increase should use the hymn, 'The guest of all your folk' (RV., VIII, 74). For the folk indeed are increase and therefore he gains increase.³ Some say that one should not use that

¹ The term *mahāvratā* is, Śāyana points out, explained by the Taittirīya school in three ways, either *mahān bhavaty anena vratena* or *mahate devasya vratam* or *mahat ca tad vratam*. The Chandogya give the latter two explanations. See Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 6, 1, and Śāyana, ad loc. For the whole, cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 21, 1; Taittirīya Saṃhitā, VI, 5, 5, 31; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 4, 1, 21, 22; *Pri. Lex.*, s.v.

² The two Ājyas recommended are RV., VIII, 11 and VII, 1; the reference is to the view of the Śākhāyana Āranyaka, I, 2. The former is the *prākṛta* because it is an Ājya Śāstra in the Agnistoma, the latter the *zakṛta* because it is an Ājya Śāstra in the Vīśvajit (see Kaṇṭhaki Brāhmaṇa, XXV, 11). The Aitareya holds that only the *zakṛta*, VII, 1, should be employed, according to Śāyana because the Agnistoma which is the *prākṛta* has twelve Śāstras, and if there were two Ājya Śāstras the Mahāvratā would have thirteen. VII, 1, which is the Ājya Śāstra, is also at the same time a *śāntya* *agnyaśāstra* used by those who desire proper food (see I, 1, 2).

³ This is the rendering adopted by Max Müller from Śāyana, who explains that Varṇas making large earnings offer much taxation (*karam aṣṭa bhakuloṣṭha prayachanta*, which Max Müller takes as 'increase their capital', but this is in view of *prayachanta* (Śāyana on Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 29) hardly possible). Perhaps it would be possible to translate: 'For he (Agni) is the increase of the folk and so he (the sacrificer) becomes prosperous,' but it is probable that the commentator has preserved the correct rendering, though of course in the original the *visṭa* *visṭa* is in the genitive. For taxation, cf. Fick, *Die sociale Gliederung*, pp. 39, 80; Rhys Davids, *Buddhists' India*, p. 48; Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra, II, 10, 26, 9, &c. Already in the RV., I, 65, 7 (see Oldenberg, *S B E.*, XLVI, 56, and Fischel, *Veitische Studien*, I, xvi) the king devours the rich. In a series of passages (XI, 5, 7, 1; XIII, 5, 4, 24; XIII, 1, 5; 43 V, 4, 2, 3) in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, cited by Winternitz (*Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 173, 174) the king receives the people, save only the Brahmins, as his food, because they pay him taxes. So often in the epic the exactions of kings are mentioned, cf. Hopkins, *India Old and New*, pp. 240, 243, n. 3; Keith, *Śākhāyana Āranyaka*, p. 68.

and now they draw nigh to it. The next three tristuchs⁷ begin with *anustubh* verses. Now the *gāyatrī* verse is *brahman*,⁸ the *anustubh* is *Vāc*, and so he unites *Vāc* and *brahman*. He who desires glory should use the hymn, 'Agni is aroused by the fuel of the folk' (RV., V, 1). He who desires children⁹ and cattle should use the hymn,¹⁰ 'The wise sacrificer has been born' (RV., II, 5)¹¹

⁷ The Śāṅkhayana Āraṇyaka, I, 2, ignores vv 13-15 of RV., VIII, 74, which form a *dana* *stuti* of Śrutarvaśa Ārśya. The reference here shows clearly that the Āitareya takes the same view of these verses. Verses 8, 9, 11, 12 are in *gāyatrī*, 14, 15 in *anustubh*.

⁸ Sayana gives as reasons for these identifications that the *parabrāhmaṇa* is set forth by means of the *gāyatrī* (RV., III, 62, 10), and that, like this *anustubh*, *Vāc* has four forms (RV., I, 164, 45, Nāraka, XIII, 9, &c. Z D M G, XXIX, 58), (*para* *polyants* *madhyama* *vaishāṇī* later, see J. A. O. S., XXII, 69, Mallinātha on Kumārassambhava, II, 17). There is no reason to suppose that the identification of *Vāc* and *anustubh* and *gāyatrī* and *brahman* has any basis beyond mere fancy, for different identifications, cf J. A. O. S., XVI, 339. The original sense of *brahman* (so throughout in contrast with *Brāhmaṇa*, the god) must clearly have been prayer or spell (cf II, 3, 8), the two ideas blending indelibly since the prayer could be regarded as a spell and vice versa (Oldenberg, *Religion der Veda*, p. 315). Deussen's view of *brahman* (*Allg. Gesch. der Phil.*, I, 1, 241 sq.) as 'der vom Heiligen, Göttlichen emporstrebende Wille des Menschen' is quite untenable, see Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, III, 212. That *Vāc* is *brahman* was the doctrine of Jīvaśa Śaṁini and it is set forth by Vajāvalkyā, Bhādarāyana Upaniṣad, IV, 1, 2, and the identification is developed in the late Logos doctrine. Cf also Tāndya Mahābrahmana, XX, 14, 2, Chāndogya Upaniṣad, VII, 2, 2, Hopkins, *India Old and New* p. 147, n. 1, with whose view of the slight importance of the Logos doctrine in this form I agree.

⁹ Sayana concludes his commentary on this Khanda by explaining that, though by the *godahomanyāya* (cf for another *nyāya* on this, Mīmāṃsa Sūtra, IV, 3, 10) the *kamyamuktas* are intended primarily for the gaining of desired results, nevertheless they make up the sacrifice and do not leave it imperfect, on the principle *kamyena nityatiddhiḥ*. This *nyāya* arises, he explains, from the rule on the new and full moon sacrifice *camasenapah pranyat godahamāna pāśubakamāya*, where as the sacrifice can be carried out *camasena* the *godahamāna* is merely *pūrvavivāhvaṇi* (see Jacob, *Aṣṭasūtra*, 3rd series).

¹⁰ In the references in the translation to the RV., where no line is mentioned, it is to be understood that the whole hymn as accepted by the Āraṇyaka is meant. When only special verses are meant their numbers are given.

¹¹ For the Śānti verses and their authenticity see Crit. Note. The verse in S *śatadhāraṇa* is RV., III, 26, 9, *asādams*, II, 43, 3, *trāṇe Agne*, VIII, 11, 1, *dhādram*, X, 20, 1, *śam no Mitrah*, I, 90, 9. *śam* occurs in Taittiriya Āraṇyaka, I, 2, cf I 21, 31, = *śiś mah śāntamā bhāvaṇi* I *drayā śpa śhādāyāś t mārāśā śaravāt* (so accented in the Anandaśrama ed.), and as here in that Āraṇyaka, IV, 42, Latyayana Śrauta Sūtra, V 3, 2 (with *v t samādāś*). The Atharvaveda, VII, 68, 3, has in the last *pāda*, *mā te yuyoma samādāś* 'may we not be separated from thy sgt', which explains the origin of the quite unintelligible *nyoma*. The verse *śac cakṣur* occurs also in Taittiriya Āraṇyaka, IV, 42 where will be found RV., IV, 31, 1-3. For *esthapi*, cf III, 2, 5, n.

In the Śāṅkhayana Gṛhya Sūtra, VI, 4 and 5, verses are given to accompany the recitation of the Samhitās (Śāṅkhayana Āraṇyaka, VII, VIII), and the formulae are placed at the beginning

¹² Cf also v Schroeder, *Die Tübinger Katha Handschriften*, p. 116, and the Śānti prefixed to the Kāṇvaśikā Upaniṣad in the Ānandaśrama ed.

2 He who desires proper food¹ should use the hymn, 'Agni men kindle from the twigs with splendour' (RV, VII, 1)² For Agni is the eater of food In the other chants accompanying the ghee offerings men approach \equiv it were more slowly to Agni, but here they come upon Agni at the very beginning, at the very beginning he³ obtains proper food, at the very beginning they smite away

of the text in the Āranyaka thus *glam vadisyams satyam vadisyami⁴ adadhānam mana niram cakruḥ | suryo jyotīsam bṛstho⁵ | dīkṣe ma ma hanuḥ⁶ |* Other verses are prescribed to precede *adadhānam*, &c., in the case of the Śakvaris and of the Māhavrata the Mantha (Sāṅkhayana Āranyaka, IX), &c. In Khanda 5 are given the expiatory formulae *udatāḥ sukṛiyam dadhe | kūt āham atmanam dadhe* and then other differing formulae (see Oldenberg's ed. pp. 163 sq. and *S B E*, XLIV, 143 sq.) Oldenberg reads *udatāḥ*, &c., as 'From here I take out the brightness (I)', but I would much rather take *udatāḥ* (and the version in the Anandakrama ed., p. 295 accents *udatāḥ*) as 'He, arisen gives forth brightness. That (brightness) I appropriate to myself', referring to the beneficial and purifying effects of the radiance of the sun (cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 31) Oldenberg also takes *surjo*, &c., as predicate to *adadhānam*, &c., which is hardly necessary. The phrase *sarvāḥ*, &c., probably means 'I arise whole (possibly with a suggestion of *śakṛim* i.e. complete, perfect healthy) with breath, with strength, may prosperity attend me, may the gods attend me.' The assertion *atmānam*, may be based on the magic principle exhibited in faith cures. The other clauses offer no difficulty, but *dānum*, &c. is obscure *agu* (unaccented in R) may be nom. to *apasyat*, *namāḥ* being interjected, but this is very unlikely, as *agne iṣṭi* occurs alone (see Crit. Note). It may be, 'Honour (to thee), O Agni, and oblation, but this is merely possible.

In the Manva Śrauta Sutra, II, 1, 2, 36 (cited by Bloomfield, *edic Concordances* pp. 40^a, 48^a) occurs *adadhānam cakruḥ arisam manah surjo jyotiḥ am bṛstho dīkṣe ma ma hanuḥ satya*, which illustrates the position here of *cakruḥ*. In Taittiriya Samhita, III 1, 1, 2 *dīkṣe ma ma hanuḥ* occurs. The exact words used here are found in Sāṅkhayana Āranyaka, VII, 1, 17, 1.

¹ Sayana explains *annadya* as a compound of *anna* and *adya*. Max Müller follows this view, cf. Monier Williams *Dict.* s.v. *adya*. But it is surely preferable all through to take it as an abstract of *annadya*, an eater of food, with the sense 'eating of food' which passes into the idea 'food', or 'proper food', as *annadya* has the force of 'a healthy man'. For the formation see Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1212. Oertel on Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, II, 11, 10, reads 'food eating'.

² Sayana points out that the hymn is both a *vidya* and a *śīmva* hymn. It is hardly correct to say, as Max Müller does, that it is an obligatory part of the sacrifice, since as we have seen in I 1, 1, the *śīmvasūktins* are sufficient to complete the ceremony. What Sayana means is that it is both the normal form and also a form for a special purpose. He compares the use of *śūktins* in the Agnihotra both as normal and where strength is desired, and the use of *śūktins* in the Agrosomyaspuṣa rite as normal and when might is wished. The possible forms then are (1) this hymn as normal, (2) this hymn as *annadyatima* (3) any of the other *śīmvasūktins* enumerated in I, 1, 1. In RV, VIII, 1, vv. 1-18 are in *triṣṭup* metre, the rest in *śūktins*, which explains the reference to these metres below.

³ The distinction between 'he' and 'they' is no doubt deliberate. 'He' corresponds to *annadyak* *śūktins* and 'they' to *agachants*. Sayana explains the singular by *nyamānasaḥśāḥ*, but this is unnecessary. Max Müller reads 'he' in each case. R reads *adyaḥ*, which is a correction probably of his own, for the *samjāḥ* of most of the MSS. including S¹ S² S³, but is of course most unfortunate. *Te* is almost equivalent to *eva*, cf. Delbrück, *Atindische*

evil. Because of the words (RV., VII, 1, 1^b), 'with moving of the arms they bring to birth' Agni, the hymn has the word 'birth' in it. Verily the sacrificer is born from this day, and so the hymn has the word 'birth'. There are four verses (in the *tristubh*), cattle are four-footed, the verses serve to win cattle. There are three verses (in the *tristubh*), these are the threefold worlds, the verses serve to gain these worlds. These two verses form a support. Man has a double support, cattle have four feet. The hymn places the sacrificer with his double support among the four-footed cattle.⁶ The verses if said straight on number twenty-five. Man consists of twenty-five elements. He has ten fingers, ten toes, two legs, two arms, and the trunk is the twenty-fifth. By this hymn he adorns the trunk, the twenty-fifth. Further, this day (of the sacrifice) is twenty-five, the *stoma* hymn⁷ of this day is twenty-five, like is brought about by like. So the two are⁷ twenty-five. By repeating the first thrice, and the last thrice, the verses

Syntax, p. 477; *Speyer, Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 230, and *Schielowski, Die Apokryphen des Agveda*, p. 79 who calls this use late, hardly correctly. Cf. III, 2, 6; II 1, 2, 6, 1, Aufrecht, *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 430. I think that it is most originally—or at any rate quite early—have had a sense approaching more or less to *eva*. Cf. RV., I, 145, 3 *ān it prechati nā nind* of *prechati nindere dāre nindare yid āgrāhāt*. The sense is hardly 'by his own mind alone', as Oldenberg (*S. B. E.*, XLVI, 164) takes it. The phrase is softened by *eva*, just as metaphorical phrases are softened by *quasi*, &c. in Latin (*Berger, Stylistique Latine* p. 140). This sense appears clearly in III, 2, 6 *agrabrahmanam upodakharati*. This avoids amendment to *eva* as proposed for the RV. passage by Oldenberg. So in RV., IV, 5, 8 *var iva*. See also Løgeling, *S. B. E.*, XLIII, 375, n. 2, on Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 5, 3, 1, 'Sanyasa seems to take "iva" here in the sense of "eva", as indeed it often has to be taken, especially in negative sentences.' The real sense is clearly seen in phrases like *pratarani iva āryante*, *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, III, 48, 4. See also n. 5 on II, 1, 2. So in Bhādaranyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 2, 2, for the Kanva text *eva*, the Madhyandina has *iva* explained as *eva* by the commentator (Max Müller, *S. B. E.*, XV, 159, n. 3), *ibid.*, III, 9, 28 5, for the Kanva *iva* *var*, the Madhyandina has *iva* *var* (*S. B. E.*, XV, 150, n. 5). This use is not found in independent passages of the Śākhayana Aranyaka, where in VIII, 10, *eva* takes the place of *eva* in *Āitareya Aranyaka*, III, 2, 6. Cf. also Oldenberg, *Z. D. M. G.*, LXXI, 824 sq.

⁶ Sayana is probably correct in taking *janayanta* in a timeless or present sense. Cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 930, Avery, *J. A. O. S.*, XI, 326-361.

⁷ The hymn has two metres and in one of these metres four feet, man has two and cattle four feet, and the union in the hymn produces union in reality *catuṣpadam* occurs also in *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, VI, 2, 7, where the whole phrase occurs with *°padah*. For *catuṣpadah palarah* cf. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XII, 2, 2, 20, and often in the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa. The whole phrase is also identical with *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, III, 31, 23, &c.

⁸ For this see I, 1, 4, II, 3, 4, Śākhayana Aranyaka, I, 1. The reference is to the *śākhayana stoma* in the *Prjāta Stoma* corresponding to the *Mahaduktha*.

⁹ The plural is explained by Sayana as due to the *ya* being thought of and not the hymn, but here the 'attraction' of the predicate is an adequate explanation, since such examples of carelessness are very rare. Cf., however, RV., III, 6, 3, where Oldenberg (*S. B. E.*, XLVI, 24, 6) refers *yajñīyarah* to Heaven and Earth, RV., II, 5, 6 (*ibid.*, 204), RV., VII, 93, 7. *yāt imi āgar cakre nā tāt imi uṣṣa tāt aryamādati śrābhāntu* where Agni and perhaps the other

become thirty less one, that is equivalent to a *viraj* verse minus one syllable. For in the small (womb) seed is deposited,⁹ in the small (heart) the vital spirits, in the small (stomach) food is placed. So (the *viraj* small by one) serves for the attainment of these desires. He who knows this obtains those desires. The verses include also the *brhātī* metre¹⁰ and the *viraj* metre, and the perfection of that day. They also include the *anustubh* metre,¹¹ for the chants accompanying the ghee offerings depend on *anustubh*.¹²

3 'The Prauga' should be in the *gāyatrī* metre,¹³ some say,¹⁴ 'for the *gāyatrī* is brightness and splendour and thus (the sacrificer) becomes bright and splendid.' Others say, 'The Prauga should be in the *usnīh* metre, for the *usnīh* is life

Aditya is in the mind of the poet. Ibid., II, 85-47 (altered in Āśvalayana Gṛhya Sūtra, I 8, 9), *Ārdayanti* is used of a man and wife. In *Mātrāyaṃya Samhitā*, I, 5, 12, *śrāvāḥas* is used of the gods of *brāhmanas* in IV, 1, *infra*. Cf. too the verse cited V, 2, 2 *nam na Mitravaruna karānāṃ* and Atharvaveda XIV, 1, 39, with Whitney's note. Cf. Delbrück *Altindische Syntax*, p. 102, Speyer, *Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 26 n., Oldenberg, *Z D Af G*, XXXIX, 61, n. 1.

⁹ See I, 3-7 where this recurs.

¹⁰ The verses taken together make up eighteen *viraj* verses (it is not necessary to assume the repetition of the first *viraj* thrice as does Mac Muller), and seven *anustubh* verses. Repeating thrice the last *anustubh*, and taking away eight syllables from each verse, we reach nine *brhātī* verses plus nine sets of eight syllables which taken all together are two *brhātī* verses. Cf. Śaṅkhayana Āranyaka, I, 2.

¹¹ The first verse, though called *viraj* in the Anukramanā, is really a verse of thirty-three syllables and by the doctrine that one or two syllables make no difference, it can easily be regarded as an *anustubh* of thirty-two syllables. The acc. is due to the force of *adhi*, cf. *janitvān adhi dāmbhānāṃ*, RV, V 18-8 as explained by Whitney, *A J P*, VIII, 297 and Geldner *Indische Studien* II 306. Later *Adhi* governs the acc., see Hopkins *Great Epics of India* pp. 265, 473. For the exact sense of *adhi* cf. *adhi samantāt*, Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 2, 4-1 with Eggeling's note, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* III 22-6 *virajam dānān na adharāṃpadye* *śam*, and elsewhere in the Brāhmaṇa and Sūtra literature.

¹² Ājya here, as above must mean Ājya Sūtra as Sayana takes it. The reference is to RV, III, 13 which is an *anustubh* hymn and is the Ājya Sūtra of the Agnistoma.

¹³ After the ending of the *pragṛāhas* and the recitation of the Ājya Sūtra comes the *Viśva devagrāha* and the Prauga. In the *pragṛāha* the Agnistoma the Prauga consists of seven *viraj*, comprising RV I 2, and 3 ascribed to the poet Madhuchandas, in the Śaṅkhayana Brāhmaṇa, V 5. The Aitareya Āranyaka keeps these *viraj* for the Prauga, in the Śaṅkhayana there is used a set apparently of seven *viraj* (RV, VII, 95, 1-3, 4-6, VIII 61, 1-3, IV, 43 1-3, IV, 23 1-3, IV, 55 1-3, VII, 95, 4-6), in the *anustubh* metre, ascribed to Vāmadeva *Ānāṃyagya* though only three are his (Gomeda on Śaṅkhayana Śranta Sūtra II 8, 10). The series of deities, Vāyu, Indra Vāyu Mitra Varuna Aśvman Indra, Visvedevāḥ Sarasvatī is the same as in the original *viraj* of RV, I 2, 3. There can be no doubt that the Śaṅkhayana version is the later. The order of the *grāhas* is different in Kātyāyana Śranta Sūtra, IX, 13, 33. For the metres and their relation to the *śam* see Bergaigne *Journal Asiatique*, VIII, 166 sq., Bloomfield *J A O S*, XVI, 4 sq., Oldenberg *S B E*, XLVI, 301.

¹⁴ The *anustubh* Prauga is preferred in the Śaṅkhayana, but nothing is there said as to the reason here given, while arguments for the *gāyatrī* are there mentioned, which here are not used. This adds another reason for regarding the Śaṅkhayana as the later version.

rest, and at the end (of the sacrifice) the sacrificers rest on the atonement of the one day (Prauḡa)¹¹ — their rest. He rests who knows this, and they also rest for whom the Hotr priest, who knows this, recites this Prauḡa.

4 (There is the word 'ready' in the verse,) 'Come hither, O Vāyu, conspicuous, these Soma draughts have been made ready' (RV, I, 2, 1), this day indeed is ready for the sacrificer and for the gods. Truly the day is ready for him who knows this or for whom a Hotr priest who knows this recites. In the verse, 'Indra and Vayu, these draughts are poured forth, come to what is prepared' (RV, I, 2, 4) by 'prepared' (*niskṛta*) he denotes what is 'well prepared' (*samskṛta*)¹². Indra and Vayu approach what has been well prepared by him who knows this or for whom a Hotr priest who knows this recites. In the verse, 'Mitra of holy might I summon (and Varuna) who make perfect³ the oil fed rite' (RV, I, 2, 7⁴⁰), speech is the oil \bar{m} r'e Speech \bar{m} has who knows this or for whom a Hotr priest who knows this recites. In the verse 'Aśvins (accept) the sacrificial offerings' (RV, I, 3, 1⁴), the sacrificial offerings are food and this serves to gain food. The Aśvins go to the sacrifice of him who knows this or for whom a Hotr priest who knows this recites the verse, 'Come hither, ye whose path is red' (RV, I, 3, 3). In the verses, 'Indra of bright splendour, come hither, Indra impelled by prayer, come hither, Indra hastening, come hither' (RV, I, 3, 5⁴, 6⁴, 4⁴), he recites, 'Come hither, come hither'. Indra goes to his sacrifice who knows this or for whom a Hotr priest who knows this recites. The All-gods come to the call of him who knows,

It is a curious inversion of ideas by which the old popular rites retained no doubt reluctantly in the ritual become regarded as improper and needing atonement.

¹¹ Max Müller takes *prastūṭhādikāḥ* as separate from *śantyaṃ* but suggests that *śāntāḥ* may go with *śantyaṃ*. This certainly seems better, as it avoids the identification of *śāntāḥ* and *śantāḥ*. 'At the end' refers to the fact that the Mahāvratā is the last day but one of the Saitra. For *prastūṭhā* as a medical term see Hoernle, *J R A S*, 1907, p. 24.

¹² From *niskṛta* comes the Vedic *niskṛta* according to Bloomfield, *J A O S*, XVI, xxvi. For *samskṛta* as 'well cooked', see Thomas, *J R A S*, 1904 p. 243, Hirste, *J R A S*, 1905, p. 353. For *is* and *is* cf. Oldenberg *S B E*, XLVI, 2 4. For *aram* above, which \bar{m} against *alam*, *ṽ, 2 3*, is a sign of early date, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* I, 211 sq., Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, pp. 43 sq. *alam* already appears in the Atharvaveda. The syntax \bar{m} normal, see Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax* pp. 146 147. Sayana, probably correctly, explains that the hymn has the word *aram* because the day \bar{m} *aram*, not vice versa. The use of *rai* favours this.

¹³ Sayana interprets *śāntāḥ* either as dual or as equivalent to *śāntayantam*. In the original the *śāntāḥ* has *śāntāḥ* in *śāntāḥ* (cf. Fickel, *Vedic Studies* III, 190).

¹⁴ This is the most probable interpretation of *Rudraśāntāḥ*, Fickel, *Vedic Studies* I, 33, but of III 71, Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 49. Others take as 'whose path is terrible'. Sayana renders 'whose path is like that of Rudra unobstructed'. According to R's division, here and above, *dā* must be taken as 'He says' (the verse), but the position of *aryā* is hardly possible and the later examples show conclusively that *a ā* goes with what follows, as \bar{m} is taken in S.

or for whom = Hotr priest who knows recites the verse, 'Ye All gods, protectors, supporters of men, come hither' (RV, I, 3, 7) In the verse, 'Ye givers, (come to) the libation of the giver' (RV, I, 3, 7^c), he means the libation of every giver Whatever = man wishes when he recites this verse, that wish the gods fulfil, if this he knows or if for him = Hotr priest who knows recites In the verse, 'May the holy⁴ Sarasvatī accept our sacrifice, she that is rich in prayer' (RV, I, 3, 10), speech is denoted by 'rich in prayer' Speech is his who knows this or for whom a Hotr priest who knows this recites When he says, 'May she accept our sacrifice,' he means, 'May she bear it away' These verses if said straight on number twenty-one⁵ Man consists of twenty-one elements He has ten fingers, ten toes, and the trunk is the twenty first By this hymn he adorns the trunk, the twenty-first By repeating the first thrice and the last thrice the verses become twenty five The trunk is the twenty fifth, and Prajapati is the twenty fifth He has ten fingers, ten toes, two legs, two arms, and the trunk is the twenty fifth By this hymn he adorns the trunk, the twenty-fifth Further the day (of the sacrifice) is twenty five, the *stoma* hymn of that day is twenty five,⁶ like is brought about by like So the two are twenty-five

ADHYATA 2

The two tristichs, 'Thee I like a car to aid us' (RV, VIII, 68, 1-3), and, 'This juice is poured, O Vasu' (RV, VIII, 2, 1-3) are the first and second of the Marutvatiya hymn⁷ Both are perfect in form as belonging to the one day ceremony⁸ Much indeed is done on this day that is forbidden, and (the Marutvatiya) is the atonement. Now atonement is rest, and so at the end (of the sacrifice) the sacrificers rest on the atonement of the one day (Marutvatiya) as their rest He rests who knows this and they also rest for whom the Hotr priest, who knows this, recites this Marutvatiya In the verse, 'Indra, come

⁴ Probably the original form was *parokṣ* Arnold *Vedic Metre*, p 143, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xi, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, § 110

⁵ Cf I, 1, 2 ad fin

⁶ The *stoma* peculiar to the Mahāvratā is the *pañcavimsa stoma* in the *rajanā* melody in the Prṣṭha Stotra corresponding to the Mahaduktā, Sankhayana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 7 3, 4 The explanation of 'Prajapati' as twenty-fifth is variously given, cf 'Nirukṣaṇa' note on Sankhayana Āranyaka I, 1, and see also below, II, 2 4

⁷ This is the first Śastra at the midday pressing The *pragathas* used are made up of two verses expanded (Sayana *parasmaipada vyasamukhe pragathānena tasya sampadyate sa yam pragathā*) The *dharmas* are interpolated verses to fill up the Śastra For the terminology, *pragathā* and *anukāra*, see Hillebrandt, *Ritual Literature*, p 103 For *mātra* below, see Eggeling, *S E E*, XII, xx-xv

⁸ See I, 1, 3

nigher, with thy strengths preserve thy singers"² (RV, VIII, 53, 5-6) (there is the word 'singers'), this day indeed is a hymn, and being possessed of a hymn, the form of this day is perfect (There is the word 'hero') in the verse, 'Let Brahmanaspati come forth, hither the hero' (RV, I, 40, 3^{4c}), the form of this day indeed is perfect is endowed with strength (There is the word 'heroic might') in the verse, 'Rise up, O Brahmanaspati, heroic might' (RV, I, 40, 1^a, 2^b), the form of this day is perfect as endowed with might (There is the word 'hymn') in the verse, 'Now doth Brahmanaspati proclaim the hymn of praise' (RV, I, 40, 5), this day indeed is a hymn and the form of this day as endowed with a hymn is perfect (There is the word 'slaying Vritra') in the verse, 'Agni, the slayer of Vritra, will bear' (RV, III, 20, 4^{3c}), the slaying of Vritra is a characteristic of Indra, this day is Indra's, and Indra's is the form of this day. (There is the word 'strong') in the verse, 'Thou art strong by insight, O Soma, thou art mighty in thy might and greatness' (RV, I, 91, 2^{3c}), might indeed is a characteristic of Indra, this day is Indra's, and Indra's is the form of this day (There is the word 'strong') in the verse, 'They fill full the waters, they lead forth the strong one like a horse for rain' (RV, I, 64, 6^d), strength indeed is a characteristic of Indra, this day is Indra's, and Indra's is the form of this day. Further in that verse, 'They milk the thundering never failing spring' (RV, I, 64, 6) (there is the word 'thundering'), thundering indeed is a characteristic of Indra, this day is Indra's, and Indra's is the form of this day (There is the word 'great') in the verse, 'To great Indra' (RV, VIII, 89, 3), what indeed is great, is large, the form of this day as endowed with largeness is perfect. (There is the word 'great') in the verse, 'Sing a great song to Indra' (RV, VIII, 89, 1), what indeed is great is large, the form of this day as endowed with largeness is perfect (There are the words 'was in the way of' and 'stayed not') in the verse, 'No one was in the way of, none stayed, the chariot of

² Sayana takes *prāsūta* as a noun = *anugṛāha dāya*

³ This is I take it, the meaning. The verses contain words because the day has certain qualities. It is also possible to invert the relation, and derive from the epithets in the verses the qualities of the day but the position of the verse in the sentence points to the former interpretation as slightly the more probable, and that view is supported by Śaṅkharāyaṇa Āranyaka, I, 3 ad fin. *matolāva hy etad aśaś*. The literal version is 'As to the words, &c.'

⁴ The argument seems to be (1) *Vytraha* occurs in the verse, because (2) Indra is *Vytraha*, and (3) the day is Indra's. Possibly it may be, because the word *Vytraha* occurs, therefore, Indra is *Vytraha* and this is Indra's day.

⁵ *vajinas* means 'having food' according to Sayana. It clearly meant originally 'having energy'. Cf. Oldenberg, *S B E*, XLVI, 18 and Index, s. v. *vja*, Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, I, 10, 45.

⁶ Sayana renders *parjaya* as *svartham na calatam* and *na siramad* as *tena rakṣena rananam aya* *hatur* = *Arjuna*, and *parjastat* as *lobhinatragaman* *ya parita'calamavat*. It is difficult not to believe that this absurd interpretation, which is that of the Āranyaka, was

Sudās' (RV., VII, 32, 10); the form of this day as endowed with the terms *parjastā* and *rānti* is perfect. He recites all the Pragāthas to obtain all the days, all the Ukthas,¹ all the Pṛsthas,² all the Śāstras, all the Praūgas, all the pressings of the Soma.

2. He recites³ the hymn, 'Fair has been my effort, singer; slayer of truth' (RV., X, 27). True, indeed, is this day and perfect its form as endowed with truth. This hymn is composed by Vasukra. Vasukra indeed is *brahman*, and this day is *brahman*. Thus by *brahman* is *brahman* commenced. Here they ask: 'Why then is the Marutvatiya Śāstra commenced by Vasukra's hymn?' Because no other than Vasukra produced⁴ a Marutvatiya Śāstra nor separated it. Therefore by the hymn of Vasukra the Marutvatiya Śāstra is commenced. This hymn is not addressed to any definite deity⁵ and is therefore Prajāpati's. For Prajāpati is undefined, and the hymn serves to win Prajāpati. Once⁶ he describes Indra, and so the hymn retains its form as Indra's. He recites the hymn, 'Drink the Soma, for which in anger thou breakest' (RV., VI, 17) (There is the word 'mighty') in the verse, 'The cow stall, Indra, mightily being lauded;' the form of this day as endowed with the word mightily⁷ is perfect. This hymn is

deliberately chosen wrongly. The exact sense of the original is, however, open to doubt, cf. Ludwig and Griffith's translations.

¹ The Ukthas here meant, Śāyana says, are those for the *ukthyakratu*, following the Yajñyapalya Śīman. The Pṛsthas are the four Pṛstha Stotras of the midday pressing. The Śāstras are those of the Ājya and other rites. The Praūgas are the Śāstras of the Prauga and are specially mentioned on the *nyāya*, *brahmanāḥ dīgataḥ parvurjagād aya dīgātāḥ* (so Ś; R reads *abhy*², which is nonsense).

² For these, see Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XXVI, 339. For *aptyas* and the very numerous similar datives, cf. Speiser, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 274; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 970. They differ from ordinary infinitives in not being construed clearly as verbal forms, but governing the genitive as *here* and in Śaikhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 5, 6, &c., and as always in Celtic (Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 535).

³ This Khandā contains the general form as well as the specifically Mahārata part of the Marutvatiya. See on V, 2, 1, which gives only the special part, and cf. Śaikhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 3, where Vasukra is equated to Indra. He occurs also in Bṛhaddevatī, VII, 30, &c.

⁴ I.e. brought out of the Samhitā. The perf. here has a certain propriety, it expresses a relation not exactly that of mere past, and approximates to a present. Cf. n. 6. For *athā karmāt*, cf. Altareya Brāhmana, III, 24, 7, &c.

⁵ Cf. Macdonell, *Sarvanukramanī*, p. 183, *Bṛhaddevatī*, II, 256, Sieg, *Die Sagenstoffe des Rigveda*, pp. 7, 8. See Altareya Brāhmana, III, 30, 3. *Ita etc dhāgye anurukto Prjāpati*, VI, 20, 18; Kaṣṭhaki Brāhmana, XXIII, 2; Maitrīyaṇī Samhitā, III, 6, 5; Nirukta, VII, 4. Śāyana says Prajāpati is *anurukto* as he has no *mūrti*. Śaikhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 1 has: *anurukto vai Prajāpatiḥ*. Cf. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XVII, 333; Lévy, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, p. 16.

⁶ In RV., X, 27, 22. The Bṛhaddevatī and Sarvanukramanī ascribe X, 27-29 generally to Indra, with certain exceptions (Macdonell, *Bṛhaddevatī*, I, 127).

⁷ Clearly the Āraṇyaka takes *śaśā* as an accusative-*śaśāḥ*, and presumably, like Śāyana, *grāṇas* is active. *Śīḥ* in the original is taken by Griffith in his translation as a vocative from

composed by Bharadvāja, and Bharadvāja was of seers the most learned, the longest lived, and the greatest practiser of austerities. By this hymn he drove away evil. When* therefore a man recites the hymn of Bharadvāja, it is that

mañis against the accent. Cf. also Grassmann and Ludwig's translations. For the passive sense of *grana* cf. Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 362, Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax* p. 264.

* The form *apsakatyā* may be either a dative, 'for the driving away,' or an ablative, more probably the latter, as presumably the sense is that Bharadvāja attained his length of years by the hymn rather than the reverse. *asa* above = clearly differentiated in time from the narrative, cf. Śaṅkhāyana Aranyaka, VI 1, where the imperfect *anasat* describes the dwelling from time to time of Gargya Balaḥ, while *asa* is used to denote his permanent character, and *apara* in describing his conversation with Ajitakratu. This use of the perfect as a narrative tense = not a sign of lateness when the use is different from that of the imperfect. In the Tandyā Mahābrahmana itself *avasa* and *asa* (XIII, 6 9) are both found in such cases. Cf. also Aitareya Brahmana, III, 48, 5. *Bharadvāja ha vas kṛiḥ dīrghak pāṭha asa* i.e. 'drives', and III, 48, 4. The position of the Aitareya Brahmana and Aranyaka as early appear clearly from the following table of the proportion of perfects to imperfects (see Whitney, *P A O S*, May, 1891, pp. lxxxv sq., slightly modified) —

Tandyā Mahābrahmana, I	130
Taittiriya Saṃhitā, I	70
Maitrayāya Saṃhitā, I	64
Taittiriya Brahmana, I	30
Taittiriya Aranyaka, I	9
Śatapatha Brahmana, VI-VIII, I	30, I V,
	9 II
"	" XIII 1 5 XI 5 4
"	" IX, 2 5, XIV, 7 5
"	" X, 1 3, (includ. ag
	Bṛhadaranyaka Upaniṣad)

Śatapatha Brahmana XII, I	2
Jaiminiya Brahmana, I	4
Gopatha Brahmana, II, I	5
"	I 1 2
Kaṇvaśākhā Brahmana, 3	5
Chāndogya Upaniṣad, 4	1
Aitareya Brahmana, I IV, I	40
"	" V, 1 16
"	" VI 1 2
"	" VII, 4 1
"	" VIII, 5 3

The earlier part of the Aitareya (I XXVI) can thus claim to be older than anything save the Taittiriya and the Saṃhitās and may be as old (for in such small matters as those of the Aitareya the proportions are not fair) as the Saṃhitās (Brahmana parts of course). Against this sporadic cases like *sam lakṣe*, *lajjate*, *sacra* (Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 222) cannot be regarded as of decisive weight. *lajjamaṇ* indeed as a Prakritism* would be note

* Fick *Deus Besti*, VII, 270 takes *lajj* from Ind. Germ. *lag** according to the ordinary and early phonetic rule, if so the Prakritism would disappear. The view of Leumann (Wackernagel, I, 220) is, however, more probable, cf. also Dr. Schefelowitz's forthcoming book, *Zur Stammbildung in den indogermanischen Sprachen* § 10. Dr. Schefelowitz gives an interesting example of the way in which the texts were corrupted (though he does not apply it for this purpose). In later Vedic times *ts* and *ks* became frequently *ck*, and such forms found their way into the text of old work instead of the proper forms. Later still efforts were made to replace correct forms instead of obvious Prakritisms with in some cases unfortunate results. E.g. in Samaveda, I 3, 1, 4 9 (= I, 231) *pyśm* as Benky (*Glossar*, p. 228) says is for RV, VIII, 31, 15 *pyśm* via *pyśm*. So may be explained *akṛiḥ* Aitareya Brahmana, VIII, 2 (cf. *Andivichā* vol. 7, 428), *kr. antara* (K+*Andivichā*). Cf. in Naighantika, II, 27, *pyśmāḥ* (cf. Roth's crit. note, p. 16) for IV *pyśm*, and for *pyśmā* (K Z, XI, 264 sq.) the MSS. of Atharvaveda, X, 9, 27, offer either *pyśmā* or *pyśmā* (Leumann, *Album Kern*,

he may become, by the driving away of evil, learned, long-lived, and versed in asceticism; for that he recites the hymn of Bharadvāja. He recites the hymn, 'With what splendour do ye who are of equal age and dwell together?' (RV., I, 165). (There is the word 'praises') in the verse, 'They call for me, the praises long for me' (RV., I, 165, 4°); this day is praise and the form of this day as endowed with praise is perfect. This is the *ayāśubhija* hymn,² and it is harmony and

worthy, but when II is considered that the form is unique (III, 23, 7), that the later language had always *ayaj* and that *ayā* was a common word, there can surely be no hesitation in restoring *ayāmanā*, just as the Atharvan Prākritisms, cited above, must be removed. The exact verbal form of the text cannot always be relied upon, and II may be noted that, as Silyana's note on VII, 10; 11 shows, in his time some versions of the Aitareya Brāhmana had, which some had not, these chapters, of which the second is a mere corruption of Kautaki Brāhmana, VII, 11 (see Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmana*, pp. 236, 282, 444). The case of the Gopatha Brāhmana may be held to contradict the deductions here accepted, since Bloomfield (*Atharvaveda*, pp. 164 sq.) has shown grounds for holding that the Pūrva is not later than the Uttara, but this objection is not of importance, since it is the case that the two parts owe most of their grammatical forms to these sources and the Pūrva borrows from the Śatapatha Brāhmana, XI and XII, in the first of which books the number of perfects is very high, while the Uttara exploits the Aitareya, &c. The potential in *asa* (see Aufrecht, p. 429) also urged as a sign of late date is merely, in all probability, an inaccurate analogical form to forms like *śa* (*dadhata*, &c.), and gives no criterion of date (cf. Liebh, *Pāṇini*, p. 32) *amantrayāsa* *asa* occurs only in VII, 17 and proves nothing for the earlier part of the Brāhmana. Pāṇini, III, 2, 49, allows only *śa* (Liebh, p. 33); but as there can be no doubt of the priority of the Aitareya Brāhmana to Pāṇini (cf. Liebh's own paper, *Beitr. Beitr.*, XI, 309), this clearly shows either the selective character of Pāṇini's work or more probably the incorrect transmission of the text (the Śākhāyana has *astre*, Liebh, pp. 80, 81). The use of *asas* (for *asam*) is apparently a note of the Aitareya Brāhmana's style, not a proof of date.³ Liebh (p. 30) holds that *asa* was obsolete in Pāṇini's day in prose and says Yaska uses only *bahāṣya*. I cannot accept this view as to Pāṇini.

² The story of Indra, Agastya, and the Maruts has received full treatment from Sieg (*Die Sagenstoffe des Rgveda*, pp. 108-119). He holds that RV., I, 170, 171, and 165 make up an *ilbhāsa* to the effect that Agastya offered a sacrifice to the Maruts. Indra came and claimed it, and Agastya had to pacify Indra and the Maruts. The result is possible, but not certain. The Kautaki Brāhmana, XXVI, 9, has (as amended by Sieg, p. 117, n. 7): *daya lūhā*

p. 307; Whitney, *Translation of Atharvaveda*, p. 604). So II khills, I, 2, 9°, MSS. read *prinyants* for *prinyants* and this Prākritism is found in Varttika 2 to Pāṇini, VII, 3, 37. See also Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 125.

³ Aufrecht's view (*Aitareya Brāhmana*, p. 11) of the dependence of the Brāhmana parts of the Taittiriya Saṃhitā seems borne out by the citations in his 'Anmerkungen'. It may be noted that the Brāhmana parts of the Saṃhitā cannot well be separated much in point of time from the Brāhmana itself and that Brāhmana deals with the late Perśamedha (Winternitz, *Gesch. der ind. Lit.*, I, 167). Cf. also Taittiriya Saṃhitā, VI, 3, 10, 5 and Taittiriya Brāhmana, I, 5, 6, 6 with Aitareya Brāhmana, VII, 12, 3 (ibid., p. 124, n. 2). Noteworthy also is Winternitz's remark (p. 175, n. 1) that in Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, XXX, Buddhists are not mentioned, though that section must be later than the oldest Brāhmana.

abiding, the *kaṣṭhūbha* hymn. For by means of it Indra, Agastya, and the Maruts came to harmony. So the recitation of the *kaṣṭhūbha* hymn tends to harmony. Further the hymn tends to long life. So if the sacrificer be dear to the priest, let him recite for him⁸ the *kaṣṭhūbha* hymn. He recites the hymn, 'Indra, with the Maruts, powerful, for joy' (RV., III, 47). There are the words 'Indra, powerful', power indeed is a characteristic of Indra, this day is Indra's and Indra's its form. This hymn is composed by Viśvāmitra. Now Viśvāmitra was the friend of all, and all is the friend of him who knows this and of those for whom a Hotr priest, who knows this, recites this hymn. The hymn 'Thou art born, terrible, for strength, for energy' (RV., X, 73) is one containing *nivide*,⁹ and, as belonging to the one day ceremonial, is perfect in form. Much indeed is done on this day that is forbidden, and (this hymn) is the atonement. Now atonement is rest, and at the end (of the sacrifice) the sacrificers rest on the atonement of the one day (*nividdhana*) as their rest. He rests who knows this, and they also rest for whom a Hotr priest, who knows this, recites this *nividdhana*. If recited straight on, the verses number ninety seven.¹⁰ The ninety is made up of three *trīṇī* sets of thirty, and then

satayasaḥ saṁśa itī maruṭatayam | *tas etat saṁjñanam santam suktaṁ* | *etena hendraś ca Maruṭaś ca saṁjñantam*, which must go back to the same source as the Aitareya version, found also in Aitareya Brahmana, V, 16 which agrees verbally with this passage. For *saṁjñana* see also Bloomfield, *Ātharvaveda*, pp. 72, 73.

⁸ The gen. here is probably possessive and predicative (*eius factus*), cf. Spitzer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, §§ 63 and 71, Liebh, *Ess. Beitr.*, XI, 307 sq., Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 161, while the gen. with *priya* is adnominal and regular from RV. onwards. Not unmetrical is the transition from such genitives to the genitive which is really a dative, e.g. Aitareya Brahmana, VII, 15, 7 *tasya satam datta* would if *krto* were put for *datto* be quite regular. On the other hand in *tasya frat daddāti* (ibid., II, 40, 6) the gen. is practically dative. In Pāli (Müller, *Pāli Grammar*, p. 67) and in Prākrit (Püchel, *Prākrit Grammar*, p. 246) the dative of the indirect objective is always represented by the genitive, the dative of purpose alone surviving. Cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 297. Note the dative with *mātram* below, and genitive in *chetan paśunam*, I, 2, 3, and Geldner, *Pāṇische Studien*, I, 183. On the low morality of the Brahmanas cf. Lévy, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, p. 9, Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Lit.*, I, 180 sq., Garbe, *Philosophy of Ancient India*, p. 62.

⁹ In Sankhayana Aranyaka, I, 3 the word is in RV., VI, 19, see Śrauta Sūtra, VII, 19, 20. The *pragṛth* is as here ibid., 15, Kausitaki Brahmana, XXV, 3. *Atvā* are early and apparently were known in Vedic times, cf. Haug, *Aitareya Brahmana* pp. 32 sq., Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, IV, 355, XVIII, 96, Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p. 387, n. 2, Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, VII, 124 n. 2, Scheffelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rigveda*, pp. 136 ff. Here the *atvā* comes in after the sixth verse.

¹⁰ Sayana explains thus the two *trīṇī* referred to in I, 2, 2 = 6, six *pragṛthas* each of two verses made into a *trīṇī* = 18, three *dāhyas* = 3, *asat* = 24, *śrīda* = 15, *kaṣṭhūbha* = 15, *maruṭaś* Indra = 5, *paṁsthā* *agraś* = 11, total 97. But in I, 2, 1 there are seven *pragṛthas* which would amount to 14. Apparently the author overlooked this although of course the explanations are possible. Oldenberg (*Prolegomena*, § 353) thinks that some of the *pragṛthas* may have been counted as two, others as three verses.

there are seven which are over. Whatever is praise of the seven is also praise of the ninety. If the first and last are repeated thrice the verses number 101. There are five four-jointed¹¹ fingers, two-pits, the arm, the collar bone, the shoulder-blade; these make up twenty-five. The other parts¹² have twenty-five each, making a hundred, and the trunk is the one hundred and first part. The hundred is life,¹³ health, strength, glory; the sacrificer is the hundred and first, resting on life, health, strength, glory. These verses become *trustubh*.¹⁴ For the midday pressing is accompanied by *trustubh* verses.¹⁵

3 They ask, 'Why is a swing¹ a swing?' He who blows is the swing He

¹¹ The four are, according to Sāyana, *agra*, *madhya*, *mala*, *tannūla*, and he notes that though the *angustika* has really only three, it is given a fourth for the sake of symmetry. So in the systems of Caraka and Susruta (Hoernle, *Osteology*, pp 122, 123) there are sixty phalanges, giving fifteen in each hand. Here the phalanges and the metacarpus are reckoned as phalanges. In Śākhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 3, each *śāsti*, on the other hand, is given three *śardūni*, which is the more correct view, and perhaps later. The expression *kakṣat* is doubtful. It cannot mean 'armpits', for there is but one on each side; Max Müller says the pits 'in the elbow and the arm'; Monier-Williams, *Dict* (where the reference is inaccurate) gives the sense as the two depressions on the wrist, Sāyana says *kakṣasya śardū adhvayam*, and possibly the *armpit* may be conceived of as in some way double. He takes, followed by Max Müller, *akṣat* = eye, but (a) *śīra* is a separate element and the eye belongs to it; (b) the form is unparalleled. Friedlander holds that *akṣa* (Ar. *akṣ*, Lat. *axilla*, O.H.G. *akṣala*) means 'shoulder blade', but that is the meaning of *apophalata* in the systems of Caraka (Hoernle, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, p. 13), perhaps of Susruta and Vāgbhaṭa (*J. R. A. S.*, 1906, p. 931, *Osteology*, pp 76, 91). *akṣa* must mean 'collar-bone', as I would take it in Śākhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 4 (*akṣat* and *akṣat*) and as in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (*akṣa*). The later form is usually *akṣala*, though *akṣa* is found in the 'non medical version of Ātreya', see Hoernle, *Osteology*, pp. 53, 134, = 1, and my review, *Z. D. M. G.*, LXII, 135 sq. Sāyana's error is found in the commentators on Yajñavalkya and in the modern translations.

¹² 1 = the left side, and the two sides of the lower body, which have five four-jointed toes, a thigh, a leg, and three *śardūni* ('joints', Max Müller, rather 'articulations', Hoernle, *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, p. 931) according to Sāyana.

¹³ Because life is one hundred years and the other things depend upon it, Sāyana explains, probably correctly, as there is no doubt that life as one hundred years is a very early idea, see Lanman, *Sanskrit Reader*, p. 384 and ref., and Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XVII, 193, *Festzug an Roth*, p. 137. Cf. Vajasaneyi Samhita Upaniṣad, 2.

¹⁴ Because the last hymn is *trustubh* (Sāyana). But all the hymns in that Khanda are in *trustubh*.

¹⁵ Cf. *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, III, 12, 3-5, *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, IV, 2, 5, 20, and other passages cited by Bloembergen, *J. A. O. S.*, XVII, 4. For the seven *śardūni*, cf. Wachsmann, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 41; *Z. D. M. G.*, XI, 678.

¹ The use of the swing refers, in the opinion of Oldenberg (*Religion der Veda*, p. 444) to the sun, which is called 'the golden swing in heaven' in RV, VII, 87, 5. This is quite probable, as the Mahāvratā rite is, at least to some extent, a sun charm (cf. *Introd.*, p. 28). Sāyana's interpretation follows the text and makes the swing Vāyu, as does Śākhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 7. I, 2, 4 below is in favour of the sun, cf. *Kaṭhaka Samhitā*, XXXIV, 5, cited in *Int. Stud.*, III, 477. Compare the *śārdū* of the young hymns, clearly a vegetation rit.

swings forward in these worlds and then is a swing a swing 'There should be one plank,' some say, 'for the wind blows in one way and (the swing should be) like the wind' But this is not to be accepted' Others say, 'There should be three planks, for threefold are these worlds and (the swing should) resemble them' But this is not to be accepted There should be two planks, for these two worlds² seem most real, and the ether between them is the sky. So let there be two planks. Let them be of *udumbara* wood³ The *udumbara* is sap and proper food, and planks of it serve to win sap and proper food. Let them be raised in the middle For in the middle food delights men, and so he places the sacrificer in the middle of proper food. There are two kinds of ropes,⁴ the right and the left The right serves for some animals, the left for others. When there are both kinds, they serve to win both kinds of animals. The ropes should be of *darbha*⁵ grass For of all plants *darbha* is free of evil,⁶ and so they should be of *darbha* grass

² This is the constant phrase of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. That of the Kaṭhaka Brāhmaṇa and it may be added of the Śaṅkhayana Āraṇyaka, is *na tad aditya*. Cf. Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* p. 432, Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, pp. 38, n. 6, 44 = 1

³ The ether or sky is as Sayana points out, invisible. *Adhātama* (for *adhā*, cf. Wachter, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 178, and Speyer, *Indische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 228) is a curious word, which occurs also in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, which also has, VI, 3, 1, 24, *anādīkajurita*, on which see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 121, n. 2, Eggeling, *S B E*, XLII, 197, Hillebrandt *Ritual Literature*, p. 167

⁴ Cf. Śaṅkhayana Āraṇyaka, I, 7, where there is one plank only *tad va udumbaram bhavaty ūrg va anmadyam udumbara ūrg nna-hasyopītyas*. The seat of the Udgātṛ also is of *udumbara* wood. Tāndya Mahābrāhmaṇa, V, 5, 2 *audumbari bhavaty ūrg udumbara ūrgam anavarundhi*. The Śaṅkhayana passages look like an imitation, while the Aitareya may well have followed the Tāndya (cf. *anavarundhi*). Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 6, 3, has *ūrg va dnam udumdrak*. Cf. also Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa III, 2, 1, 23 and often.

⁵ Sayana explains right and left as fashioned by the right and left hands respectively, perhaps twisted from left to right and right to left respectively. The plural *rajyasū* is probably due as he says to the fact that as is said in V, 1, 3 *Śaṅkhayana Śranta Sūtra*, XLII, 2, 3, the ropes are each of three strands. It should be noted that Āraṇyaka V differs in the purpose assigned to the ropes which it associates with the holding together of the swing. Similarly it recognises the number of planks as three or two, while two is here prescribed. Again, I, 2, 4 the height of the swing is fixed as a *manu*, while V, 1, 3 gives as alternatives *caturṅgula* or *manu*. These remarks show that the last book must differ considerably in date from the first.

⁶ On *darbha* cf. Eggeling *S B E*, VII, 84, Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 70.

⁷ The construct on of the genitive with a positive is based on the analogy of the superlative, e.g. *infra*, I, 2, 4 (Speyer, *Indische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, §§ 65, 91 II). Similarly the ablative is found dependent on a positive, e.g. RV, V, 10, 4 (Oldenberg *S B E*, XLVI, 390), Speyer, *Indische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 58, *Sanskrit-Syntax*, p. 73, Delbrück, *Grundriss*, III, 1, 216, Fischel, *Göt. Gel. Anz.*, 1884, p. 509 *Indische Studien*, I, 309 Geldner, *ibid.*, III, 76-77, and see II, 3, 1, n. 6. For the word *apakahatapāṇa*, cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, IV, 25, 4 *apakahatapāṇinā* and *anakahatapāṇinā*, Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 3, 21 (Max Müller, *S B E*, XV, 168, n. 3), Chāndogya Upaniṣad, I, 2, 9, VIII, 2, 5, 4, 1, 2, 7.

they⁷ mount to food and fortune. The Hotrakas⁸ with the Brahman sit down on seats of grass. Plants and trees having grown up bear fruit. So then if they mount all together on this day they mount on strength, on sap, on proper food. This serves to win sap⁹ and proper food. Some say, 'Let him descend'¹⁰ after saying *rasat*¹¹. But this is not to be accepted. For the honour done to one that sees it not¹² = indeed not done. Others say, 'Let him descend after taking the food'. But this is not = be accepted. For the honour done to one that has approached near is indeed not done. Let him descend after seeing the food. For that = honour indeed which is done to one who sees it. Therefore only after seeing the food, let him descend. Let him descend towards the east, for in the east is born the seed¹³ of the gods. Then let him descend towards the east.

⁷ They, i.e. the Hotr and Udgatr. Max Müller follows R in translating 'he', but this makes nonsense and the commentary shows that R is wrong.

⁸ They are the Hotr's assistants, viz. Pristad, Brāhmanachakṣuṣan, Potr, Netr, Agnadhra, and Acchavaha. The division is not strictly accurate, as the second, third, and fifth are really classed with the Brahman and the Netr with the Adhvaryu but it corresponds to facts better than the later classifications, see Weber *Ind. Stud.*, X, 242 sq., Oldenberg, *Religion der Inder*, pp. 283 sq., Hillebrandt, *Ritual Literatur*, p. 97. *vrak* may perhaps be better spelt *brak*. Both the *v* or *b* and *r* present difficulties, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 284, 233. Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 26. See Geiger, *Leitfaden der Sanskrit Sprache*, p. 28. The following sentence is quoted in the Naigeya Anukramani, *Ind. Stud.*, XVII, 373-374.

⁹ Max Müller suggests that *iso* before *aryak* is expected. If it had occurred, it would have been quite natural, but it is not necessary to suspect the text as the reading above is *īnam eṣa tad iṣyam annadyam* and the *eta tad* renders it less unnatural that *iso* should not occur. The phrase *eṣa tad* is very common in the Aitareya Brahmana, *tad* being of course adverbial. For the usual *ayadeten*, cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 29.

¹⁰ The descent does not of course come here in its proper order, but is inserted to complete the discussion of the topic of the movements of the priests.

¹¹ The reason for this being rejected is that it is only after the second *rasat* (the *annarasat*) that this *śakṣa* comes up, so that it could not see the priest on the way descending in its honour (*Sāyana*). For the word, cf. Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 172. Foy, *Z D M G*, L, 229. Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 34. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XI, 111, 269, for the form, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 2091.

¹² For the form *opatyate* cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* II, 1, 77. Delbrück, *Vergl. Syntax* II, 529 sq., *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 240 sq. *Adhvryiṣya* appears clearly to come from *√ys* in the sense 'move' (cf. Greek *ekathropeō*). The separation into two roots (maintained in Böhtlingk and Meiner Wallens's *Dict.*) seems quite needless (cf. Whitney, *Roots*, &c., p. 140), as *ṛtsi*, *spears*, can easily be derived from *√ys* as *trias*. Cf. also Khilla, IV, 53 (ed. Schellertowitz).

¹³ Max Müller suggests, and S apparently independently also suggests, that the reading may be *devourtaḥ samprajayate*. But the use of *samprajayate* = curious as the *am* has no intelligible force and on the other hand the form *retas* is not impossible, as forms from *a ar*, *ara*, exchange more or less freely throughout Sanskrit, see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 415, 1319, and a long list in Wackernagel, op. cit. II 1 113-114, in a Babylonian *aguristas* occurs in the *Śatapatha*, ibid., 111. In Pala of course the *asa* form prevails, Müller, *Pala Grammar*, p. 65. Cf. also Fackel, *Prakrit Grammar*, §§ 407 sq.

ADHĪĀA 3.

They say, 'Let him begin this day' with saying the word *him*. In the word *him* = *brahman*, this day is *brahman*, and so he begins *brahman* by means of *brahman*,¹ who knows this. Now with regard to his beginning with the word *him*, the word is masculine,² and the *re* feminine. They make a pair and so he makes a pair at the beginning of the hymn for the sake of offspring. Children and cattle are his who knows this. Again with regard to his beginning with the word *him*, the word is *as brahman* like a wooden shovel.³ Just as one desires to dig up anything with a wooden shovel, so with the word one digs up *brahman*. Whatever he desires, he digs up with the word *him*, who knows this. Again with regard to his beginning with the word *him*, the word is the discrimination of divine and human speech.⁴ So he, who begins with the utterance of the word *him*, discriminates divine and human speech.

¹ The time of *himṛtya* and *pratiṣṭhāya* are obviously really identical. This is readily explained by the originally timeless force of the form *ṛtya* (cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, II 889, 894). So the nonst participle in Greek sometimes coincides with the time of the verb, e.g. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, p. 212. Dehnbach (*Altindische Syntax*, pp. 405-409) holds that in all these cases the distinction of time between the main verb and the gerund exists, but, however natural the growth of this use is, it is only to be found in the examples by forcing the sense. Speyer (*Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 223) lays stress on the 'aoristic' effect of the weak root and appears to think that this accounts for the past force. But it should be noted that in Vedic we have no evidence that the forms were ever felt as other than participles either present or past. In *śrīyam dṛṣṭvā kṛtvā tatpā* it is most probable that the writer did not feel *dṛṣṭvā* as 'after having seen', but as 'seeing'. Cf. my remarks in *J R A S*, 1907 p. 164. For beginning the Mahārata with *him*, cf. Śaṅkhayana Aranyaka, II, 1. For *him* + *4kr*, cf. Whitney, § 1079. It is obsolete in the classical language.

² Cf. I, 1, 3, 2, 2.

³ Cf. I, 2, 4. The use is found in the Antareya Brahmana, VI, 3, and often in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. For the idea, cf. the stories of the wedlock of the *siman* and *re* in the Śatapatha (IV, 6, 7, 11, etc.), and Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, and Antareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 22, 2.

⁴ Sayana explains this as a metaphor from the search of hidden treasure, a probable supposition in the case of India, where burial of treasure (cf. Gāṇḍhāra Dharma Sūtra X, 43-44, Vasuṣṭha Dharma Sūtra, IV, 23, 24, Manu, VIII, 34-39, Yājñavalkya, II, 24, 35) has always been frequent in consequence of the uncertainty of life and government. A different idea is found in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VI, 3, 2, 5, 4, etc.

⁵ That is, it distinguishes ordinary conversation from divine service. The Śaṅkhayana Aranyaka II, 1, gives different reasons for the importance of *him*. In Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VI, 3, 1, 34, where the same distinction occurs, Sayana explains as Sanskrit and Apabhramśa (Eggeling, *S B E*, XLII, 200, n.), *dayas* must be correct *dayas* cannot well be adjectival, and the error in the MSS is trifling. Cf. III, 2, 5. It is noteworthy that later *dayas* is used for Sanskrit, cf. Dandin Kavyadarśa I, 33. *saṃskṛtasya mama datuḥ eva antakā* cf. *maharṣidhīk* Franke (*Pale and Sanskrit*, p. 89) compares the fact that Mathura was called 'city of the gods' because of the Kṛṣṇa tale *dasyajñ*, and is inclined to think that 'secondary' Sanskrit came to India from Kāśmīr via Mathura, a hypothesis which can hardly be regarded as probable.

2. They say, 'What is the beginning of this day?' Let him reply, 'Mind and speech'. All desires rest on the one, the other yields all desires. All desires rest on the mind,¹ for with the mind man conceives all desires. All desires rest on him who knows this. Speech yields all desires, for by speech man expresses all desires. Speech yields all desires to him who knows this. Then they say, 'One should not really begin the day with a *ṛc*, *yajus*, or *sāman* verse, nor start from² a *ṛc*, *yajus*, or *sāman* verse'. So one should say the *ṛgśhrīti* first. The *ṛgśhrīti* are *bhūh*, *bhuvah*, and *svah*,³ and they are the three Vedas. *Bhūh* is the Rgveda, *bhuvah* the Yajurveda, and *svah* the Sāmaveda.⁴ Therefore

The real meaning of the discrimination is suggested by Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 12, 13 *aniti vai darśayati tatheti mātṛimāḥ | divyena cāpānam san mātṛimāḥ sa pāpāni evaṃśa pramukhate*, cf. Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 162, n. 1. The later use of *darśayati* must be related to Devanāgarī. For the question of Prakrit, cf. I, 5, 2, 8. In the Rāmāyaṇa passage where Hanumānt ponders as to addressing Sītā, the possibilities he contemplates are (according to Jacob) *evam mātṛimāḥ samśkrītiḥ*, or *d yātrīti* *evam samśkrītiḥ* which appears clearly to discriminate between the popular and sacerdotal forms of Sanskrit. That the former expression means (as Dr. Gerson, *Ind. Ant.*, LVIII, 56, holds) the Prakrit of the educated Kāśīyas and well to do persons round the court appears exceedingly improbable. Nor is it correct to say that these forms of Sanskrit were practically alike. The Epic and the Sanskrit of the Brahminical schools are of distinctly different style, and Sītā might well have been surprised at being addressed not in the Kāśīya fashion but by priestly expressions, much as a lady of the middle ages would find a great difference between the address of a countess and a monk, even when both spoke the same Latin language.

¹ Sayana explains this as referring to the need for care in going through the service, composed as it is of mixed verses.

² Sayana explains that the desires are phases of mind, *manovollakṣaṇāḥ* which is too subtle for the Āranyaka. Cf. Bhāradvāyaka Upaniṣad, III, 2 *manasā hi kamanā kāmayaḥ*, and Jacob, *Concordance*, p. 292, Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VI, 2, 3.

³ Max Müller following Sayana, takes the words *maro*—*synd* as giving the ground for the rule referred to in *śādhur*. But this leaves no *iti* to mark the end of the rule referred to in *śādhur*, and in view of the usual practice of the Āranyaka, it is safer to take the quotation as extending to *synd*. There is no doubt that the construction of the last part of the sentence is not easy. For the abl., cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 107 sq.; Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 51.

⁴ For the later history of the triad see Deussen, *Philosophie der Upaniṣads*, p. 196, E. T., p. 217. See also Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 13, IV, 12, and I, 2. Taittirīya Upaniṣad, I, 5, 6, shows clear signs of a later origin than the Aitareya by its elaboration.

⁵ On the three Vedas and the Atharvaveda, see especially Bloomfield, *Atharvaveda*, pp. 21 sq.; Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 191 sq.; Hopkins, *Great Epic of India*, pp. 22 sq. The silence of the Āranyaka is certainly in favour of its early date. It is of course true that the Atharvaveda contains much old material⁶ and probable that a Samhitā existed before the Āranyaka was written (cf. Taittirīya Samhitā, VII, 5, 11, 2, where the Angirases are referred to

⁶ I agree with Winternitz that Oldenberg's view (*Literatur des alten Indien*, p. 41) that prose magic formulae are older than 'poetic' which are imitations of the poetry of the hymns of the Rgveda is not probable.

he does not really begin the day with a *re*, *jayur*, or *saman* verse, nor start from ■ *re*, *jayur*, or *saman* verse

3 He begins with *tad*¹ this. Now ² *this this*³ is food, and so thus he obtains food. Prajapati indeed uttered this ■ the first word consisting of one syllable or of two,⁴ viz *tata* or *tata*. So ■ child when it first speaks utters the word of one or two syllables, *tata* or *tata*. So with this very word with *tata* in it⁵ he begins. A R⁶ says (RV, X, 71, 1), 'O Brhaspati, the first point of speech,' for this is the first point of speech. 'Which they have uttered making a name,' for by speech are names made. 'That of them which was the best and flawless,' for this is the best and flawless. 'That ■ hidden in secret by their love and yet ■ made manifest,' for this as regards the body ■ secret, merely the deities (who enter the body) but as regards the gods⁷ it is made manifest. This is the meaning of the verse.⁸

(apparently as a fourth Samhitā), and Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 110), but the recognition is a sign of later date (Taittiriya Samhitā, VII, ■ not probably early, but, like VI, is later than the Anureya Brāhmaṇa).

¹ *Tad* is the first word of the first stanza of the first hymn of the Aśokeya Sāstra the so-called *Rajanya*, RV, X, 120, 1.

✓ ² It may be rendered 'thus word *tad* (= *tat tad aī*), but Sāyana takes it as a repetition. The repetition of *aunam* is apparently not connected with that of *tad* though it may have been helped by it.

✓ ³ Max Müller seems to regard the two alternatives as *tat* and *tata* or *tata*. This of course is the usual signification of *śakṣara* and *dyakṣara* but Sāyana refers these words ■ the quantity of the first and second syllables in *tata* and *tata* respectively. The form of the sentences makes this seem certainly correct however unusual it may be. ⁷ *He may have here early evidence of the omission of the final a in ordinary conversation.*

⁴ I take *tat* *tata* *tad* separately and *eva tat* as = 'so'. This seems also to be Sāyana's interpretation. Max Müller says 'With this very word, consisting of *tat* or *tata* (cf. the reading of L) he begins,' and in a note 'If *tat* is called the very same word, *eva* is used in the sense of *etia*. This appears rather unsatisfactory, and Sāyana is probably right in thinking *tat* and *tata* similar enough for the purpose here in view. This passage indeed, seems to be a deliberate and somewhat elaborate variant of the older legend (preserved in Śatapatha Brahmana, XI, 1, 6) by which Prajapati when he first spoke uttered *śākā bharaṇā*, and *jayur*, which are words of one and two syllables respectively. Sāyana has *ekena āvartena* *śakṣakṣara* i d *abhyām āvartadīkṣakṣara* *upeta dyakṣara*. *śakṣakṣara* is apparently an adject. Dyandya with disjunctive force, cf. Wachernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* II, 1, 70, Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 73 sq., *ergl. Syntax*, III, 224 sq. for early examples. The whole sense is little more than that *tad* which is equal to *tat(a)* or *tat a* ■ the name which, as *brāhmaṇa*, ■ revealed in the deities and implicit in man in whose organs, &c., the deities are (as in II, 1, 5, Śukhāyana Āraṇyaka, IV, 1, &c.).

⁵ For *adikṣaralam*, cf. Chāndogya Upaniṣad, I, 3, 1, &c., Whitney, *P A O S.* Oct., 1870, p. 18. So often in Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa.

⁸ This stanza is very obscure. Sāyana quotes Āśvalayana Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 11, 8, where it is laid down that a child's secret name is only to be known by father and mother until the *upanayana*. That this is what is referred to here is not impossible, as Max Müller points out,

4 He begins with, 'That was the oldest in the worlds' (RV, X, 120, 1), for that ■ indeed the oldest in the worlds 'Whence sprung the terrible one with brilliant might,' for from ■ he was born who is terrible with brilliant might 'Immediately on birth he destroys his foes,' for immediately on being born he destroyed evil 'After whom all helpers rejoice,' for all creatures are helpers, and they rejoice after him, saying, 'He' has risen, he has risen' 'Growing by strength, the powerful one' (RV, X, 120, 2) for he grows by strength the powerful one 'As foe he smites fear into the Dāsa,' for all fear him 'Taking that which breathes and that which breathes not,' this refers to the living and the lifeless 'What was offered in the feasts came to thee,' this means, 'all is in thy power' 'All turn their thoughts on thee' (RV X, 120, 3), this means all beings, all minds, all thoughts, turn on thee 'When these two become three helpers,' these two being united produce offspring Children and cattle are his who knows this 'Join what is sweeter than sweet with the sweet,' for the pair is sweet, the offspring sweet, and so with the pair he joins the offspring 'He' conquered by the sweet that which is sweet,' for the pair is sweet, the offspring is sweet, and thus through the pair he conquers offspring. A Rv¹ says,

but the interpretation adopted in n 4 above seems to render the reference quite unnecessary } The last verse he explains as meaning that the form of the gods who enter the body is hidden from men but the gods themselves know the name well : This is practically meaningless, and Max Müller suggests that it may be that the name refers to the gods or to *śat* the *brahman*. The reference however, to the deities who enter the body is clearly meant in some form of II, 4 2, 1, 5 and the sense is the *brahman* = *śat* which is the beginning of speech and the first of names is revealed (as the gods) and implicit in man. This section is referred to by 'Sayana' on Atharvaveda XVIII, 4 77 see Lanman in Whitney's *Atharvaveda*, p 892

¹ The *īva* RV, X, 120, 1-3, which begins is a *śloka*, because it corresponds to the *Paṇḍita* Saman

² i.e. *brahman* (Sayana) The explanations of this hymn in the *Āranyaka* must be deliberately perverse so absurd are they Cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 221 p 6

³ The double *śat* *śat* is, according to Sayana because he is *śatya* of heaven and Agni or earth. The exact use of the norist is characteristic of the early character of the text, cf Whitney's criticism of Delbrück (*Synt. Forsch.*, II 8-36, *Altindische Syntax*, pp 280-289) in *A J P* XIII, 190, *Spec. per. I edische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 174

⁴ Sayana takes *śat* as referring to *anukūman* which is *śamodā* i.e. consoling of the son and daughter in law *Madhura* is equal to grandchildren, and *śakyaś* is 'provide', i.e. 'provide that dear pair with dear offspring, our grandchildren' He does not therefore even follow the *Āranyaka* which clearly took *śamodā* as accusative. Max Müller translates 'And this (the son when married) be as very sweet conquered through the sweet.' But this represents neither the *Āranyaka* nor Sayana.

⁵ This verse which is not in the *Ṛgveda* is not by any means clearly connected with the rest. Sayana gives two alternatives that it is connected with the verse *śatish śatish śatish śatish śatish* : *śam*, or with the whole *Śastra* (not as in Max Müller, that it is connected with the hymn *śat śat śat*, or the *Veda* in general) In the first case 'this body' is the body of the sacrificer, the other

'Since he raised this body in that body,' he means this body consisting of the Veda in that corporeal body* 'Then let this body' be the medicine of that,' he means this body consisting of the Veda is to be the medicine of that corporeal body. Of this eight² syllables are *gāyatrī*, eleven are *tristubh*, twelve *jagati*, and ten *viraj*. This consisting of ten syllables rests in the other three metres. The three syllable word *purusa*³ goes into the *viraj*. These indeed are all metres, the three and the *viraj*. To him who knows this⁴ thus in this day completed with all the metres.

5 He extends the verses by the use of *nada*¹. *Nada* indeed is man. So a man speaking sounds as it were. In the words *nadam va oḍaṇam*² (RV, VIII, 69, 2), *oḍaṇaḥ* are the waters in heaven, for they water all this, and they are the waters of the mouth, for they water all proper food. In *nadam yoyutaniṁ*, *yoyutaṇaḥ* are the waters of the sky, for they inundate as it were, and they are the waters of perspiration,³ for they run constantly as it were. In the words *patni vo agbhyānam*, *agbhyāḥ* are the waters that are born of the smoke of fire,⁴ and they are the waters that spring from the organ. In *dhenūnam*

body the body of the parents and the result is seen in *śraddhā*, &c. The other case gives the interpretation of the Ananyaka, as Sayana himself admits, *tad etad doṣṭyaṁ vṛkhyānam anyas ty odina brāhmanena spastikṛyate*. This shows how little Sayana felt bound to follow his authorities. The words *svam-arrajata* occur in various guises in Atharvaveda, VII, 3, Taittiriya Samhitā, I, 7, 12, 2, Maitrayani Samhitā, I, 10, 3, Aśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra, II, 19, 32, Śaṅkhayana Śrauta Sūtra III, 17, 1.

¹ The body of the sacrificer (Sayana)

² The hymn *tad id oṇa* (Sayana)

³ The hymn, RV, V, 120, is *tristubh*, and the desired metres are only obtained by torturing it. The first, second, and fourth *paḍas* have ten syllables the third eleven. The first eight of the first *paḍa* gave the *gāyatrī* the remaining two added to the ten of the second and fourth *paḍas* the *jagati*, and the first, second, and fourth (or rather the fourth), the *viraj*.

⁴ Because by adding *pu* to the first *paḍa*, *ru* to the second, *sa* to the third, the verses all become *tristubh*. See V, 2, 6.

⁵ In *svam and* (perhaps one word), cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, 1, 63 *vidusa* may be genitive (cf. = 8 on I, 2, 2) or dative.

⁶ The exact meaning is explained in V, 2, 6. After each *paḍa* of RV, V, 120, 1 is inserted (besides the syllables *pu*, *ru*, *sa*) one *paḍa* of the hymn, RV, VIII, 69, 2, so as to make a *brhati*. Cf. Śatapatha Brahmana, VIII, 6, 2, 3, and Eggehaug, *S B E*, XLIII, 113, n. 1.

⁷ Sayana explains the verse with reference to juice produced at the third pressing of the Soma, the *ryita* (cf. Hillebrandt, *Ved. Aftsk.*, I, 135 sq.), and takes *nadam* as the sacrificer, and supplies *raṭata*. For the real sense see Fischel, *Vedische Studien* I, 191 sq.

⁸ *śraddhā* is clearly correct, the accusative being cognate. *Rs śraddhā* is primarily attractive but is improbable, and as a perusal of p. 80 will show, he (like the MSS., cf. Whitney, *P A O S*, Oct., 1887, p. xiv) is very uncertain about nasals. Cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 275, Speller, *Deutsche und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 24, Delbrück, *Vergl. Syntax* I, 366, 368.

⁹ Sayana gives two interpretations, either smoke (in the shape of a cloud) produced by fire, or from smoke and fire, quoting *haladā*, Meghaduta, 4, *dāhmagyātīkṛtīmanarūṣaṁ*

rudhyasā, the *dāna-āś* are the waters, for they stir all this, and by *rudhyasā* he means 'thou art lord'.¹ He extends² a *tristubh* and an *anustubh*. For the *tristubh* is male, the *anustubh* female, and the two are a pair. So a man having taken to himself a wife regards himself as it were more complete. By repeating the first verse thrice, the verses become twenty five.³ The trunk is the twenty-fifth, Prajapati is the twenty fifth. He has ten fingers, ten toes, two legs, two arms, and the trunk is the twenty fifth. He adorns this trunk, the twenty-fifth. Further the day (of the sacrifice) is twenty five, and the *stoma* hymn of this day is twenty five, like is brought about by like. So the two are twenty five.

6 He begins⁴ with *śad*, this. Now 'this this' = food, and so thus he obtains food. Prajapati indeed uttered this as the first word consisting of one syllable or of two, viz. *śata* or *śata*. So a child when it first speaks utters the word of one or two syllables, *śata* or *śata*. So with this very word with *śata* in it he begins. A Rv. says (RV, X, 71, 1), 'O Brhaspati, the first point of speech,' for this is the first point of speech. 'Which they have uttered making a name,' for by 'speech are names made'. 'That of them which was the best and flawless,' for this is the best and flawless. 'That is hidden in secret by their love and yet is made manifest,' for this as regards the body is secret, namely the deities (who enter the body), but as regards the gods it is made manifest. This is the meaning of the verse.

7 He begins with the hymn, 'That was the oldest in the worlds' (RV, X, 120, 1). What is oldest is great, the form of this day as possessing greatness⁵ is perfect. (There is the word 'greatness' in the verse, 'That fame of thine, O Maghavan, through thy greatness' (RV, X, 54, 1), the form of this day as possessing greatness is perfect. (There is the word 'strength' in the verse, 'He groweth more for strength' (RV, VI, 30, 1), the form of this day as possessing strength is perfect.

śan nīpīśāś hīśa nīpīśāś. The waters are *agnya*, he says, because plants and trees are to be tended by all. Cf. also Brhaddeśata IV, 41, which explains RV. I, 164, 43. *śatamayam dhāman* Atharvaveda, IV, 10, 25.

¹ 'Thou art food', in Max Muller's translation must be a slip. *patyan* is regular, see Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar* § 1061, and is found in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa in this form.

² *śad id ara* is in *tri tubh*, *madam na odātum an anu tubh*. The former is male because bigger than the latter. For the following cf. Levi *La Doctrine du Sacrifice* p. 157.

³ The twenty five are made up by nine verses of RV, I, 120, 1, six of X, 54. Five of I, 1, 30 and three of I, 51, 4 which are mentioned in I, 3, 7 below. Cf. I, 1, 2, 4 and n. 6 on I, 1, 1.

⁴ This is a mere repetition of Khanda 3 and the ascription of it here according to Sayana is for the glory of the whole hymn whereas the purpose of it as Khanda 3 was to extol the word *śad*. This may be correct, but it is very obscure.

⁵ The difference in the first two verses of course is that in the first *prishnor* needs to be equated to *madat*, whereas *maditva* actually occurs in the second. For the construction, cf. I, 2, 1, n. 4.

(There is the word 'hymns') in the verse. 'Then, manbest of men, with songs, with hymns' (RV, III, 51, 4), this day is indeed a hymn, and the form of this day as possessing a hymn is perfect. He extends the first two² verses, which are deficient, by a syllable. In the small³ (womb) seed is deposited, in the small (heart) the vital spirit, in the small (stomach) food is placed. This serves for the obtainment of these desires. He obtains these desires who knows this. The two of ten syllables serve to obtain both kinds of proper food, that which is footed and that which is footless.⁴ They become eighteen syllables apiece.⁵ Of the ten, nine are the breaths,⁶ one is the self. This is the perfection of the self. Eight syllables⁷ remain in each. Who knows this obtains whatsoever⁸ he desires.

8. He extends the verses by means of *nada*.¹ Now breath is sound. Therefore every breath, when it sounds, sounds loud as it were. The verse *nadam va odātām* (RV, VIII, 69, 2) is by its syllables² an *usukh*, but by III feet an *anustubh*. *Usukh* is life, *anustubh* speech. Thus he places speech and life in him. By repeating the first verse thrice, the verses become twenty-five. The trunk is the twenty-fifth, Prajāpati is the twenty-fifth. He has ten fingers, ten

² That is RV, X, 120, 1^a, with ten syllables, and VIII, 69, 1^a, with seven. He adds *pu* to them.

³ Cf I, 1, 2 ad fin.

⁴ I.e. animals and vegetables (Sāyana)

⁵ I.e. ten syllables in RV, X, 120, 1^a, the syllable *pu*, and seven in VIII, 69, 1^a. Similarly with the other three *śuklas*.

⁶ (*śruti*) *chidraṇi* is the version of Sāyana and it is as probable as any other, though the word originally meant breath and only metaphorically is transferred to its use as describing the organs of sense. The nine 'orifices', seven in the head and two in the body, according to a Śruti (Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, II, 5, 9, 10; 6, 8, is the reference, I think) cited by Sāyana (*soṣṭa vai śrutyāḥ prāṇaḥ deṇa ānāśān*), are referred to in the Āśhala Upaniṣad, V, 1 (where = all, however, there are eleven), Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, III, 18, Yogakṣhā Upaniṣad, 4, Yogatattva Upaniṣad, 16, and elsewhere. They are ears, eyes, mouth, nostrils and organs of evacuation, with the nasal when ten are counted, as in the Jaiminiya Upaniṣad, and Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa, II, 77 (*J A O S*, XV, 240), and *brahmavandhā* when eleven are counted. Cf Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, II 243, II T, p. 265; *Sehling Upanishads*, p. 181, n. 1, and *nava vai śruti prāṇaḥ*, Sāṅkhya Ānanyaka, II, 2, which points to a different 10en, for which see I, 4, 1, n. 5, 5, 1, n. 6, 2, n. 13.

⁷ That is, after deducting the ten from the eighteen.

⁸ In his interesting note on relative clauses in the Veda, Edgren, *J A O S*, May, 1883, pp. xii-xv, points out that unlike Greek, Ionic Sanskrit uses the aorist *ed* pronoun with the indic. This rule is not observed in the later Vedic literature, e.g. *Āśhalyāna Gṛhya Sūtra*, I, 3, 1. *atā āhalya yatra kva ca kanyā syat*, &c.

¹ I.e. by the stanza, RV., VIII, 69, 2.

² It has four *śuklas*, and is therefore like an *anustubh*, which of course it really is. But it has in the Samhitā form only twenty-seven syllables, or resolving the *y* in *agāyama* in *āśā* 3, twenty-eight, which is the number of syllables in an *usukh*, which, however, has three *śuklas* (8+8+12) only.

toes, two legs, two arms, and the trunk is the twenty fifth. He adorns this trunk, the twenty fifth. Further this *dyū* (of the sacrifice) is twenty-five, the *stoma* hymn of this day is twenty-five, like is brought about by like. So the two are twenty-five. Thus = the twenty fifth with regard to the body. Now with regard to the deities. The eye, ear, mind, speech, and vital spirits, these five deities¹ have entered into this person, and he has entered into these five deities. He is then pervaded wholly in all his limbs up to his hair and nails. So all beings, down to ants, are born thus pervaded. A Rv says (RV, X, 114, 8), 'A thousandfold are these fifteen members,'² for five arises from ten. 'As large as heaven and earth, so large is it,' for the self is as large as heaven and earth. 'A thousand-fold are the thousand nights,'³ thus does the poet please and magnify the members. 'As far as *brahman* extends so far does *Vac*,' wherever there is *brahman*, there is *Vac*,⁴ wherever *Vac*, there is *brahman*, = what = meant. The first⁵ of these hymns has nine verses, for nine are the breaths, and it serves to win them. The second has six verses, the seasons are 4x, and it serves to win them. The third has five verses, the *pañkti*⁶ has five feet, and it is food, so it serves to win proper food. Then comes a tristich, there are three threefold worlds, and it serves to conquer them. These verses become *brāhatis*,⁷ the

¹ Cf I, 3, 3 above II, 4 2

² 'Then' is taken by Max Muller as referring to the five deities, by Sayana = referring to the body in which *śrutas* is. But the latter view seems quite sound. The senses and *śrutas* are absolutely later connected. For *sangāh*, cf Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 3 3. For *ś* cf Speiser *Vedic and Sanskrit Syntax* § 83, *J A O S*, \VIII, 131 sq.

³ *śukla* Sayana translates *atītiya* *ekādaś* and, as hymns will not do he must be approximately right. His view is that the fifteen are made up of the five above mentioned and the corresponding five elements (earth, water, fire, wind, and ether) forming the mother and father. But this = more than doubtful. For the ten the *ātman* comes with its five organs and a complete body.

⁴ Because the senses are applied to a great variety of objects (Sayana).

⁵ *Brāhman* is in all and wherever a name is given, it is there, cf I, 3, 3. Sayana quotes a Śruti Taittiriya Āranyaka III, 13 *satvanti rūpaṇi vaco'ya dharaḥ | namana brāhmadādan yad aṣṭi ||* For the very close connexion of *brahman* and *Vac*, see I, 1, 1, 2 8, Atharvaveda, IV, 20, Bloomfield, *Atharvaveda*, p 83.

⁶ RV, X 120 has nine verses. The repetition of *esam* = due, says Sayana, to the comparative nature of these hymns as used in the Śāstra, the first *esam* refers to the hymns as they stand in the Śāstra, the second to them alone as they stand in the Samhita. This is of course impossible. For the nine *śrutas*, see I 3 7, = 6. For the seasons, cf Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, pp 373, 374, Oldenberg, *S B E*, \LXI 134.

⁷ *annam* is *pañcti* *ānandam* = *āhāt* = *āhāra* *pañctirūpaḥ* *āhāra* *pañctirūpaḥ* *āhāra* *pañctirūpaḥ*, Sayana. For the tristich and the worlds, cf Śākhayana Āranyaka, II, 3.

⁸ The first *pañkti* of RV X, 120 1, has with *śr*, eleven syllables the first *ś* *da* of I V, \VIII, 69 1, seven verses, making eighteen. So two *ś* *das* give thirty six syllables or a *brāhatis*. The twenty three verses give forty six *brāhatis*, as each is extended similarly (Sayana).

metre, the immortal, the world of the gods. This is the body. Even so he who knows this comes by this way near to the undying self.¹¹

ADHYĀYA 4.

Then comes the *sūdadohas* verse.¹ *Sūdadohas* is breath and by breath he joins together all joints. Then the neck verses.² They denote them as *usyāh* verses according to their metre. Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse. *Sūdadohas* is breath and by breath he joins together all joints. Then come the head verses. They are in *gāyatrī*, for it is the beginning of the metres, and the head is the beginning of the members of the body.³ They are in *arkasatī* verses. *Arka* is Agni. They are nine verses, the head is of nine pieces.⁴ He recites the tenth verse. It is the skin and hairs of the head. It serves for reciting more than

¹¹ Sāyana explains this obscure statement as referring to a bath as a *śetu*. It may be denied if it means more than he comprehends the immortal body (cf. *śmā*, just above), i.e. he who knows these verses thus performs that part of the rite which corresponds with the body of the bird to which the Niskevalya Śastra is likened (cf. I, 1, 1). That *śmā* above means body or trunk seems certain, and the second *śmānam* can hardly refer to anything else. If it does, it may simply mean, 'he becomes immortal.' The acc. is governed by *adhi*, cf. I, 1, 2, n 10.

¹ The Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka treats all this very briefly, II, 2, covers all Adhyāya 3 and the *sūdadohas*. The *śirṣam* comes in II, 3, before the *grāva*, II, 3, then the *pakṣu* (*akṣa*, *śīṣā*, *prahastata*), II, 4-5; then the *śatruṭṭarāṇi*, II, 6, the *alīṭa*, *gāyatrī*, *darśatī*, *śmāṇī*, II, 7-10, the *tala*, II, 11, the *divyadoha*, II, 12, the *śmādrāṇa śākta*, II, 13; the *atapaṇa*, II, 14, the *śmānubhā* *śamannāya*, II, 15; the *tristupchata*, II, 16, then two miscellaneous chapters, II, 17, 18.

Sūdadohas is interpreted as yielding milk and it represents the verse, RV, VIII, 69, 3, *śū aya sūdadohataḥ śvānam śrīvantaḥ gāyatrīḥ śmānam divyānam vīṣas traṣṭuḥ d roṇatī divā* || This is the verse immediately after the *nada* verse. Its use here is explained by Sāyana because it is *grāṇavarāṇī*. Cf. Śāṅkhāyana, II, 1: *śmānam farvām samāhātām bhātanti*. *farvām* is apparently used vaguely; cf. I, 2, 3, n 12.

² For them see V, 2, 1, which is expressly here ascribed to Śannaka by Sāyana, Introd., p. 20. *grīvāḥ* here means 'cervical cartilages', see n 7.

³ *śīrṣaḥ Prajāpatēḥ prathamam mukhato gāyatrī samutpannā* (Sāyana quoting the Yajurbrāhmaṇa), see Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, pp. 18, 53.

⁴ That is, RV, I, 7, 1-9; in v. 1 *arkasatī* occurs.

⁵ Cf. Taittiriya Saṃhitā, VI, 2, 1: *śmānam māśāṁ śīrṣaḥ usyātām* (Sāyana); *nava vai śirṣaḥ grāṇāḥ*, Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 1, and I, 3, 7, n 6. The first expression of this precise idea seems to be in the Atharvaveda, X, 8, 43: *funḍirīkam mīśraśvīm trīśīrṣaḥ guṇḍāḥ dārtam*. Whitney in his *Translation*, p. 601, thinks that the later *guṇā*s are already referred to, but as Lanman (*Translation*, p. 2045) points out, Garbe (*Saṅkhyatattvakaumudī*, *Abh. der Upanishaden*, *Abh. der Hss.*, XIX, 579) renders the three coverings as skin and nails and hair (cf. n. 6). A different view of the *grāṇā*s appears in Kāthaka Saṃhitā (XXXIII, 3, cited by Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 113, n. 2 for a grammatical point): *śāśa vai farvām grāṇāḥ śmānam divyānam* (-111b and 111b). Cf. also Kauṣṭhika Upaniṣad, II, 15.

the *stoma** These form the *trivṛt stoma* and the *gāyatrī* metre, and it is after the production of this *stoma* and this metre that there arises all that is These verses serve for production. Children and cattle are his who knows this. Next comes the *sūdadokha* verse *Sūdadokha* is breath, and by breath he joins together all joints. Then come the vertebrae verses† They are in *trivṛt* metre So one man says to another, 'Thou shinest above us,' or, 'Thou bearest a high neck,' to one who is proud‡ Or, again, because they run§ close together, they

* In the *trivṛt stoma* only nine verses of the hymn are used, but here the tenth verse of the hymn is also employed. This is not the case in Śākhyaana Aranyaka, II, 2. Sayana cites Taittiriya Brahmana, I, 2, 6 *trivṛt cāra bhāṣaḥ | tṛdāśa tūṣṭam ha stoma catur artha janyate stomaḥ* | Cf also Śākhyaana, I c. *trivṛt a aryaśaśmaḥ kapaṭam bhāṣanti*, Śatapatha Brahmana, XIV, 3, 1, 19.

† *vijṛvaḥ* is taken by Sayana as a masculine singular, he derives it from *viśvāna jṛvaḥ*, and calls it the part at the root of the wings, or, taking it perhaps as plural, from *vijṛva*, the lower bones of the neck. It is most probably a plural. Max Müller's dictum that *viśvāna* proves nothing as it must be attracted goes too far. The exact sense of *vijṛvaḥ* is doubtful. But as *jṛvaḥ* is plural and properly means 'the cervical cartilages' or windpipe, the front part of the neck, then most probably *vijṛvaḥ* is also plural and denotes the back part of the neck, the cervical vertebrae, which are usually denoted by *śaṇḍhāś* (Hoernle, *J A S*, 1906, p. 918, 1907, pp. 2, 3). This gives a perfectly good sense and seems imperatively demanded by the allusion below to a stiff-necked man, in the proverb *grivāś* is used (in a way which spoils the argument formally), either (a) as neck generally or (b) as cervical vertebrae, a sense found in the Śatapatha Brahmana, XII, 2, 4, 10 (Hoernle, p. 918). The *grivāś* of the Āranyaka must, however, be different from the *vijṛvaḥ*. Eggeling (*S B E*, XLIII 112, n. 2) takes *vijṛvaḥ* as 'the roots (nerves) of the wings' (cf. Lohring and Monier-Williams, *De f*, a. v.) and Friedlander (Introduct., p. 10) translates 'Flügelansatz'.

‡ For *viśvāna bhāṣanti*, if it is, as is not likely, attracted, cf. examples in Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 364-366, Chāndogya Upaniṣad, VI, 2, 2 *etad dīpānam idam saptam tat jayanti sa dīpaḥ*, *infra* II, 6, 1, and for Sanskrit, Speijer, *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 27. I examples, however, on non-attraction are found when needed to make plain the sense, e.g. the Chāndogya passage cited has *tat teva asī* and so passim in the Upaniṣads (see Jacob's *Concordance*, p. 127).

§ The use is very old, being found in Greek and Latin also. Cf. below, II, 2, 2 *eva rā vjṛvaḥ*, &c.; *eva rāś* *śaṇḍam*, &c. A case or two seems to occur of the reverse attraction, e.g. Maitrāyaṇi Upaniṣad, I, 2, 1 *etad vjṛvaḥ parastat dīpānam etat prafatam*, where too, however, Max Müller's note (*S B E*, XI, 288, n. 2).

* This is the translation adopted by Max Müller from Sayana. This may be correct, but the passage would certainly run better if it were taken all as one sentence. 'So one man says to another, "Thou shinest above us, thou bearest indeed a stiff neck," that is to one who is proud.' But the position of *śaṇḍhāś* renders this doubtful. On the other hand Sayana feels that it is difficult to explain the *grivāś* too. *Infra* p. 11. If taken alone, and this seems to me to turn the balance in favour of the translation here suggested. For this meaning of *grivāś* see Śatapatha Brahmana, XII, 2, 4, 10, and Hoernle, *J A S*, 1906, pp. 918-919. Śākhyaana Āranyaka, II, 2 *trivṛt vāśaḥ grivāśam parastat bhāṣanti*.

† *andāś* must be from *√da gāṇa* (Dhātupāṭha, XII, 46) as Sayana says. Monier-Williams' *De f* omits this form giving *da-ṣanti*, 'dā' '√da' 3, as the only quoted form (see v. Schroeder, *Monier Oriental Journal*, XIII, 119 1902). v. Schroeder (*ibid.*, 197, 1903) finds the same root with *apa + ś* in the sense 'anlegen' in *hāṣhāśa* Sāmhitā, VI, 2 *hāṣhāśa vāṣhāśa*, and

are taken to be¹¹ the best food For *śīraj* is food, and food strength Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he joins together all joints

2 Now comes the right wing It is this world,¹ it is this Agni, it is speech, it is the Rathantara, it is Vasetha, it is a hundred² These are the six powers of it. The *sampāta* hymn serves to win desires and for firmness The *pañkti* verse serves for proper food Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he joins together all joints Then follows the left wing It is that world, it is that sun, it is mind,³ it is the Brhat, it is Bharadvāja, it is a hundred⁴ These are the six powers of it The *sampāta* hymn serves to

haprithala Samhita IV, 1. *Laksa upaditṛyaś* and compares Greek *δωρ* *erōm*, *indm* and Latin *indus*, *enno* Winternitz (*Gesch der indisch Zeit*, I 98) still treats *dasivans* as if it meant 'I will play', as taken by Geldner (*Steden 19 Iseler*, pp 158 sq.) It cannot be from *√du* 'burn', as suggested doubtfully in Whitney, *Roots* etc., p 75

¹⁰ *samāṣṭhantamaś* is clearly the reading, from *√bāh* (i e *bāṣṭha* for *ba-ṣṭha*) It occurs in the Taittirīya Aranyaka Cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 954, Macdonell, *Pedre Grammar*, p 58, Wachernagel *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 44

¹¹ *annatamam pratyayante* is thus construed by Max Müller who says the adverbial form is vouched for by Panini, V 4, 11 The free use of comparatives and superlatives of this class is a sign of early style but in the earliest literature (RV and AV) the accusative neuter is preferred, see Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar* §§ 1111 e, and 1119 Cf also Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X 1, 2, 5 *atamam khyate* ibid., V, 4, 2, 10 *annatamam gopate* and Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p 194, *prataram eva khyante*, Altareya Brāhmaṇa III 48, 4 *te natarāni āmanam apakata*, Altareya Brāhmaṇa, IV, 22, 3 But none of these or similar cases seem to justify *annatamam*, and the sense given by Sayana as *pratyante* would equally be obtained by rendering 'they approximate towards (*prate* + *√ac*) (that which is most truly food' (fem., because *śīraj* is fem.) For such a use of *annatama* cf RV, II 41, 16 (*ambitaraṁ naditama, devitama*), and many examples in Delbrück, l c, p 193 and for the acc cf *abhiṣat padyante* with acc. I 1, 2, n 10 The acc. is governed by the preposition *śat* may be taken with *dutah* as equivalent to a finite verb which is not very probable, or with *pratyayante*, as giving the explanation of 'the *śīraj* are *śīraj*'

¹ Agni is the guardian of this world and he is also *√ac*, II 4, 2 and *√ac* is Rathantara, III, 1, 6 (Sayana) while *√asi* has brought the Rathantara

² See V 2, 2 for the verses. They are RV VII 31 22 and 23 VII 3 7 and 8 (three each according to the reckoning of the Aranyaka) I 32 (25 vv), VII 18 1-18, VII, 19 (21 vv), 20 (20 vv), 23 (6 vv), 25-29 (26 vv), IV, 20 (21 vv), making 100 in all, and then the *pañkti*, I, 80, 1, IV, 20, is styled the *sampāta* hymn

³ The moon is the deity of mind, but here the identity of sun and moon is meant, says Sayana, and *manas* is Bhat, and Bharadvāja made the Bhat

⁴ See V, 2, 2 for the verses. They are RV, VI 46, 1 and 2 VII, 60, 7 and 8 (three each according to this reckoning), VI, 18 (25 vv), 23 (20 vv), 24 (10 vv), 25 (9 vv) 31-38 (40 vv), IV, 23 (21 vv), making 101 in all, and then the *pañkti* I 81, 1 The *sampāta* is IV, 23, of Altareya Brāhmaṇa IV, 30, 2 The *śakm* is not precisely accurate, but the inaccuracy is deliberate There are 100 in the right and 101 in the left, and the *pañkti* verse ad's one to each of them For the varying sizes of the wings see Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 6, 3

Next comes the *sūdadaha* verse. *Sūdadaha* is breath, and by breath he links together all this world. He recites the eighty *brāhmi* tristichs. The eighty *brāhmi* tristichs are the sky world, and whatever glory, might, wedlock, proper food, and honour there is in the sky-world, may I obtain it, may I win it, may I possess it, may it be mine. Next comes the *sūdadaha* verse. *Sūdadaha* is breath, and by breath he links together all the world. He recites the eighty *amūh* tristichs. The eighty *amūh* tristichs are that world, heaven,² and whatever glory, might, wedlock, proper food, and honour there is in that world, and the divinity of the gods,³ may I obtain it,⁴ may I win it, may I possess it, may it be mine.⁵ Next comes the *sūdadaha* verse. *Sūdadaha* is breath, and by breath he links together all that world.

ADHYĀYA 5

He recites the *śaśa*⁶ hymn desiring all to be in his power. There are twenty-one⁷ verses, for twenty-one are the parts in the stomach. Then the *śkarimā* is the support of all *śtomas* and the stomach the support of proper foods. They are in different metres. For the intestines are larger one than the other,⁸ some small,

² The insertion of *dyauḥ* is curious and Sayana notes it as being *vāpustartham*.

³ This is taken by Sayana as being equal to *brāhman* the honoured of the gods, Indra, &c., and he quotes for it a passage intended to be Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, VI, 7 *tam āvareṃ paramam mahīvaran tam devanāṃ paramaṃ dātam* (so I, read with || *dātānam* (or *dātānam* with *ed*) *paramaṃ ca dātānam*). But, though Max Müller accepts this view, it is simpler to equate it merely to the divinity of the gods, i.e. the divine nature.

⁴ Probably *apnavam* is suggested by the *af* of *afuts* equated to *af*, as stated by Eggeling (S. B. E., XLIII, 112, n. 1). The view that *afuts* contains the *af*, eat, probably led to the identification of the *afuts* with *anna* as throughout the Āraṇyaka and also || Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 5, 2, 17, but when Sayana in his commentary on this passage calls the *afuts* *annarūpā* he merely refers, I think, to that identification and does not base it on etymology, as suggested by Eggeling.

⁵ For the subjunctive as optative in sense, cf. Speyer *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax* § 186 and for the question of subj. and opt., Goodwin, *Greek Moods and Tenses*, App. I. For subjunctives in Antareya Brāhmaṇa see Aufrecht, pp. 429-430, and a full list in Lohitlank, *Chrestomathie*, pp. 349-350. See also Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 306 sq., *Vergl. Syntax*, II, 365 sq.

⁶ In Śaṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 11, the *sūdadaha* verse is repeated twenty-four times. It agrees in counting the *śaśa* hymn as referring to the *śtoma*. The hymn is RV, VIII, 46. See I, 2, 5. It is called *śaśa* in I, 5, 2 below. The name is given because the author is Śaśa (Śāśva) says Sayana and this is probably the case, showing the early date of the traditional authorship. Cf. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 6, 2, 3, and Eggeling S. B. E., XLIII, 112, n. 2. See also Oldenberg, Z. D. M. G., XI II, 213 sq.

⁷ Only twenty of RV, VIII, 45, but the *sūdadaha* verse is counted in, see, however, || V, 2, 5 and fn.

⁸ *Iktudrum* is rendered 'coiled' by Max Müller. The rendering in the text is that of Sayana and is supported by the use of *īktudra* *va* *hi* *pa* *śuk* in Antareya Brāhmaṇa, V, 1, 5.

some big. He recites them with the word *om* according to the metre and according to the manner of the occurrence.⁴ For the intestines are as it were according to the manner of their occurrence, some shorter, some longer. Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse. *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he joins together all joints. Having recited this verse twelve times,⁵ he leaves off. Twelfefold are these breaths,⁶ seven in the head, two in the breast, three below. There are they contained, there are they perfected. Therefore there⁷ he leaves off. The hymn, 'O Indra and Agni, ye two' (RV, VIII, 40), forms the two thighs which belong to Indra and Agni,⁸ the two supports with broad bones. The

where see Sayana's explanation. For the compar., see Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 195 sq. The *Ardaya* = *sthūla* according to Sayana. The metres of RV, VIII, 45, are very various in the eyes of the Anukramanī. For the form *antastya*, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 124, c. The twenty transverse processes (*kuntapā*) in the abdominal portion of the spine (*udara*), Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa XII, 2, 4, 12, 14 (Eggeling, *S. R. E.*, XLIV, 164, n. 1, Hoernle, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 8, 10) suggest a different rendering, but the tradition is quite plausible. The epithet used too does not suit bones. ■ is, however, to be noted that in Śākhayana Āranyaka, II, 6, the *anūka* which can mean the lumbar portion of the spine (RV, VI, 163, 2, cited by Hoernle, *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, p. 917) as well as the thoracic portion (Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XII, 2, 4, 14 cited *ibid.*, 1907, p. 9) is said to have twenty-one *parvanī*, and certainly this is so strikingly parallel to the *udara* with its twenty *kuntapā* (Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XII, 2, 4, 12), since the twenty first may be the *anūka* itself, that it is possible that this passage should be ■ interpreted. But to do so would only be justified by the belief that these early medical statements rest, as Hoernle (*Osteology*, pp. 101-109) holds, on acquaintance with current medical views, an opinion I do not share for reasons given in *Z. D. M. G.*, LXII, 134 sq.

¹ *jathapapīyam* is a difficult phrase. Max Müller, following Śāyana, renders 'according to rule'. Śāyana explains this with reference to the technical rule, given by Alvalayana Śrānta Sūtra VI, 5, 11, 12, that *ekapāda* verses are to be recited with a pause in the middle and *om* at the end, while *ekapāda* verses are to have *om* prefixed and affixed. This is artificial and perhaps it only means (cf. Monier Williams' *Dict.*, s. v.) 'just as it may happen', which version suits the *antastya* better, and Śāyana ends up with practically this version. *Chandaskīram* (for the Sandhi, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 340, Aufrecht *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa* p. 430, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 71) refers of course to the different metres of the hymn. Cf. V, 2, 5, and note. For the gerund, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 995, Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 403 sq., Spenyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 224.

² That is once each ■ the verses representing the body, neck, head, vertebrae, right side, left side, tail, food in three sets of eighty *prsthā*, and the *vāsa* hymn. In the case of the tail there is a *sūdadohas* before and one after the additional verse, and so the number twelve is made up.

³ The number twelve is clearly to suit the twelve repetitions of the *sūdadohas* verse. It is probably got by taking the seven openings in the head, 1, 2, 7, 8, and adding the two in the breast, and the *nābhī*, *phrya* and *guda*. For other fanciful enumerations cf. Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 255 sq., E. T., pp. 283 sq., and Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa cited in note 6 on I, 3, 7.

⁴ He does not use that verse in the 'high' verses.

⁵ Indra and Agni are the strongest of gods and the thighs enable the bird to fly aloft (Śāyana). In Śākhayana these verses form part of what represents the tail in the Āitareya, but

verses have six feet* for firmness. Man¹⁰ has a double support, cattle have four feet. So he places the sacrificer with his double support among the four-footed cattle. The second verse has seven feet,¹¹ and he makes it into a *gāyatrī* and an *anustubh*. Now the *gāyatrī*¹² is *brahman*, the *anustubh* is *Vac*, and so he unites *Vac* and *brahman*. He recites¹³ a *tristubh* at the end. The *tristubh* is strength and with strength he surrounds animals. Therefore animals¹⁴ depend on strength for their rising and their going forth.

2 In the Niskevalya hymn addressed to Indra,¹ 'To thee, the mighty, the intoxicated one' (RV, X, 50), he inserts a *nuṣṭ*.² For clearly thus does he place strength in himself. They are *tristubhs* and *jagats*.³ They say, 'Why then does he insert a *nuṣṭ* among *tristubhs* and *jagats*?'⁴ 'One metre only

in Śatapatha Brahmana, VIII, 6, 2, 3, they are referred to the wings, see Eggeling, *S B E*, XLIII, 111, 112. See also V, 3, 1, n 1, above, p 37.

² They, except two and twelve, are in the so-called *mahepanti* metre. For the correct expression *nuṣṭ*, of the use of *nuṣṭ* for the thighs, Hoernle, *Osteology*, pp 206, 215, perhaps wrongly read for *nuṣṭ*. If *nuṣṭ* is read here, it means 'the thighs and knees are supports', cf. Vajasaneyi-Samhita, XVIII, 23, Āpastamba Śulba Sutra, XI, 2 and 3 (*Z D M G*, LVI, 362).

¹⁰ Cf I, 1, 2, n 5.

¹¹ It consists of seven *pīṭas* of eight syllables and can be made into an *anustubh* preceded by a *gāyatrī*. According to Sayana, following Aśvalayana, in the latter case there is a pause after the second *pāda*, and *am* after the third. In the former the *am* follows the fourth, and there is a pause after the second *pāda*.

¹² Cf I, 1, 1, n 8.

¹³ Sayana holds this to refer to a special mode of recitation, by which after the first *pāda* there is a pause, and *am* follows the second, and so for the third and fourth, and which he calls *tristubhamaya*. This is from Aśvalayana Śrauta Sutra, VI, 15 6, RV, VIII 40 12 is in *tristubh*.

¹⁴ This must mean, as Sayana says, and as Max Müller takes it that animals obey a master. The last two accusatives are loosely connected as accusatives of point in which, such acc are more frequent in Greek and Latin (e.g. Tacitus *Ann*, I 27 *deserunt tribunal manus insistentes, causam discordiae et intus armorum*). In the Maitreya Upaniṣad (Max Müller, *S B E*, XV, 215) so *atras paramam tapa adityam udiktamam urdhvas tisthats*. Max Müller observes that *asthaya* would be expected but it is not necessary to suspect the text. For the compound, cf. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brahmana I, 47 and 48. In *śatru parigraha* the acc is dependent on *śatru* so Anāreya Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 28, 1, 2, *tam etah paśva devatāḥ parimarijanti* (correct Speyer, *I of the and Sanskrit Syntax*, § 88).

¹ Forming part of the thigh verses.

² Sayana says the *nuṣṭ* (cf. Bhādaranyaka Upaniṣad III, 9, 1, for a *śāntideva nuṣṭ*) is to come after the fourth verse and is to be *Indra dezah tamam pabatu* (*śāntideva* S), &c (Śaṅkhayana Śrauta Sutra, VIII, 17, 1). 'In himself' he renders as 'in the bird in the shape of the Śastra'. It may mean 'in himself' only. For the *nuṣṭ* see Scheffelowitz, *Die Afrikaner der Agade*, pp 126sq. The *nuṣṭ* *janaka granthe* in R is unhappily, a myth, the reading (in R, S, &c) is *janaka*.

³ The metre is irregular. According to the Anukramanī, one and seven are *jagats*, the rest *tristubh*. Sayana offers the alternative of the last two being *jagats*.

⁴ The *prāṇis* has *tristubhs* at the midday pressing and so the deviation needs explanation. Note that the answer is repeated, and is not that of the Aranyaka itself, though it is adopted.

cannot support or fill the *ṃvid* of this day,' so he inserts the *ṃvid* among *tristubhs* and *jagatis*. Let him know that this day has three *ṃvids*.¹ The *ṛasa* hymn is a *ṃvid*, the *Valakhilyas* are a *ṃvid*, and the *ṃvid* is a *ṃvid*. So let him know that there are three *ṃvids* in this day. Then come the hymns, 'Who in the forest as it were has been put down' (RV, X, 29), and 'Who first is born, the wise one' (RV, II, 12). In these is the verse, 'When the hopes of all are on food' (RV, X, 29, 4), and it serves to win proper food. Then comes an insertion. As many decades of verses² in *tristubh* and *jagati* addressed to Indra as they insert between these two hymns, after transforming them into *brhatis*, so many years do they live beyond the normal life.³ By this insertion life is gained. Next he recites the *śajanya*⁴ hymn that cattle may come to his offspring. Then he recites the *Tarkṣya*⁵ hymn. *Tarkṣya* is welfare, and the hymn leads to welfare. Thus he procures welfare. He recites

¹ Sayana says the *ṃvid* here referred to above is the *mūḍhya ṃvid*, and the others are *aupariki*, and he assigns the use of several metres in the *vaid* and of *tristubhs* and *jagatis* in the *Valakhilyas* as the reason for their being styled *ṃvids*. The *Valakhilyas* occur in the *brhatis* tristubs see V 2, 4. The *Valakhilyas* and *Nivids* are printed from the Kaimir MS by Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rgveda*, 1906. See also Oldenberg, *Gott gel. An.*, 1907. Scheftelowitz (pp. 10 sq.) argues that the *Valakhilyas* are among the old *khilas* which were accepted by some schools (probably the Raskala and Mandukya) and not by others (*Śakalya*), who only included 'Nationalhymnen in their tradition'. Oldenberg (pp. 221-235) effectually—in my opinion—demolishes this argument and leaves the *khilas* what they have hitherto been considered, later additions to the Rgvedic tradition, though doubtless in themselves old. The *Valakhilyas* are mentioned by that name in *Kausitaki Brahmana*, XXV, 8, *Taittiriya Āranyaka*, I, 23, *Bhāṭṭarvāṇi Upaniṣad*, II, 3, &c. Cf. also Macdonell on *Brhaddevatā* VI 48, III 116. Max Müller, *Sacred Hymns*, pp. xxiii sq., who is, however, wrong in saying that they do not occur in any *khila* collection, *St. Petersburg Diet.*, VI 954.

² *Śajanya* renders *śatā nam* as 'taken from the ten thousand numbered Saṃhitā', and Max Müller takes it as 'taken from the ten Mandalas'. Neither meaning appears certain. *śatā* elsewhere means a decade, *śatāya* refers to the Saṃhitā and I think *śatānam* must mean decades. They are decades of *tristubhs* and *jagatis* turned into *brhatis*, and it may be noted that six *tristubhs* and two *jagatis* give ten *brhatis*. This may be the reference, or the reference may be to the fact that three *tristubhs* and seven *jagatis* give thirteen *brhatis*. Sayana contents himself with explaining that of three *tristubhs* and four *jagatis* nine *brhatis* can be made which does not seem to be of much help. V, 3, 2, appears to support the view here taken.

³ That is, no doubt, one hundred years, V, 3, 1, and I, 2, 2, n 14. For *śatānam* with abl., cf. Speyer, *Vedicā and Sanskrit-Syntax* §§ 53, 90, Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 113, Liebh, *Fests. Beitr.*, XI 195.

⁴ That is, RV, II, 12, called *śajanyam* in *Altareya Brahmana*, V, 2, 1. For *śajanyam* cf. Speyer, I c, § 188; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 487; Delbrück, pp. 323 sq. The form is given by Whitney, *Roots, &c.*, p. 14, as only found in the *Sūtras* and *Epics*.

⁵ RV, X, 178, addressed, says Sayana, to *Tarkṣya* Garuda, but cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 144. R reads *Tarkṣya* but the *Sarvaśukramani* and *Brhaddevatā* agree with the RV. Cf. *Kausitaki Brahmana*, XXV, 5, and III, 2, 6, n 5. For the form, cf. Wackernagel, *Alt indische Grammatik*, I, 223. Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 43.

the *ekapada*¹⁰ verse that he may at once be all and win all the metres¹¹ In the hymn, 'All songs have caused Indra to grow' (RV, I, 11), there are additions¹² to the verses: Seven verses does he make additions to For seven are the breaths¹³ in the head, and so does he place breaths in the head He makes no addition to the eighth The eighth is speech, and (he thinks), 'Let not speech be mingled with my breaths' Therefore speech, though it has the same abode as the breaths, is not mingled with them He recites the *virāḍ* verses¹⁴ *Virāḍ* verses are food, and serve to win food He ends with the hymn of Vasistha,¹⁵ that he may become Vasistha (He should end) with the perfect verse,¹⁶ with the word 'great' in it, 'This praise to the great, the terrible, the bearer' (RV, VII, 24, 5) In the verse, 'Like a steed labouring at the yoke, he has taken his place' (RV, VII, 24, 5) the yoke is the end (of the car) This day is the end¹⁷ Thus is (the verse) fit for the day (He should end) with the perfect verse, with the word 'praise' in it, 'O Indra, this praise celebrates thee' (RV, VII, 24, 5¹⁸) With regard to the verse, 'As heaven over

¹⁰ Sayana gives it as *Indro vishvam virajate*, see V, 3, 1

¹¹ It is the last of the metres used

¹² The phrase occurs also in Śaṅkhayana Āraṇyaka, II, 12, and is further explained in V, 3, 1, where Śāyana is much more explicit than in his commentary here The idea is 1^a, 1^b, 1^c, 2^a, 2^b, 2^c, 3^a, 3^b, 3^c, and so on The result is a curious intertwining *vyatirahga*, of verses A similar proceeding is found in Astareya Brāhmaṇa, IV, 3 VI, 24 For other examples of this process, called *vikharana* also, cf Śaṅkhayana Śrauta Sūtra, VII, 15, 4 (at the Āpyayana of the Madhyandina Savana), IX, 5, 4 (at the Sodāśin), XII, 11 5, and Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, VIII, 2, 7 (śalākṣilyas, when a *vyatimarṣam vikharana* takes place), Roth, *Z D M G*, XXVII, 109, who traces the practice even in the Rgveda, and Hillebrandt, *Ritual Literature*, p 103

¹³ The openings are referred to above, I, 3, 7, 8 4 1, 4, 1 The eighth as Vāc refers no doubt to the tongue The first reference to seven openings is not (as Deussen seems to hold) that in Atharvaveda X, 8, 9, which is there practically unintelligible and which is given up by Whitney (*Translation* p 597) but which appears in a more plausible form in Bṛhadaranyaka Upaniṣad, II, 2, 3, where the verse has as its last *pada* 'dag arāṁ brahmana samidāna', but that in AV, X, 2, 6, where the seven *dhāni* are given as eyes, nostrils, ears and mouth (see Whitney, *Translation*, p 568, Hoernle, *J R A S*, 1907 ■ 12) In ver 7 the tongue is specially mentioned The seven, however, seem already to have included Vāc, to judge from the explanation in that Upaniṣad, II, 2, 4, where, according to Deussen's translation, it is intended to stand for the tongue, as indeed seems clear from its being connected with Atri and *aftri*, though Böhtlingk, in his translation, ■ 26, takes it otherwise Sayana here refers to the other *pranas* as *jihvatāṅgādibhiḥ* Vāc apparently then is little more than a duplicate Cf I, 3, 7, ■ 6 For the seven *pranas*, cf also Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, IX, 5, 1, 8

¹⁴ RV, VII, 22, 1-6, see V, 3 1

¹⁵ RV, VII, 24 For the word *śīla* in ver 5, see Oldenberg *S B E*, XLVI, 135

¹⁶ The sixth verse is placed after the fourth and the fifth comes at the end, V, 3, 1

¹⁷ The last day is the *śukrayanīśataraṭra* For *dīkṣ*, cf RV, II, 2, 1 *dīkṣa idam* 'chariotree', Hepburn, *J A O S*, XIII 257 sq

heaven," give us glory' (RV, VII, 24, 5^d), wherever the speech of the Brahmin ■ uttered, this is his glory, when he who knows ends with this verse. So let him who knows this end with this verse

■ Sīyana renders, 'as in heaven so in the worlds (the *maharāṭa*, &c.) above the heaven!' The same *maharāṭa* is dropped in to explain II, 4, 1

■ Sīyana vaguely says *zadasambandhi vakyam*. But I think there is a clear reference to the speech of the Brahmins. The opposition is probably ■ yet mainly to non Aryan tongues, cf Tāndya Mahābrahmana, XVII, 1, 2, 9. Whatever be the history of Vedic and Sanskrit, it is difficult to believe at this date (800-700 B.C.) in very much development of Prakritic forms so as to render contrast with them natural though no doubt such forms existed. (Cf the discussions in *J R A S*, 1903, pp 435 sq.) See also I, 3, 1, ■ 5, III, 2, 5, Śatapatha Brahmana, III, 2, 1, 23 with Eggeling's note on the Hānva reading, Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp 20-24, Leaman's notes on Whitney, *Atharvaveda*, III, 12, 4, X, 9, 23; XII, 4, 4, XIX, 8, 4, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I xvii. The Atharvan passages point to the possibility that some of the Prakritic forms are due to the later tradition and are no evidence for the time of the Atharva. Similar considerations are familiar in the Homeric question see especially Monto, *Odyssey*, XIII-XXIV, Appendix, pp 445-484. The early date of the Epic if adopted (cf my notes, *J R A S*, 1906, pp 1 sq, 1907, pp 681-683) would bear out the view that Prakrit was not so early as has been claimed (cf Franke, *Fuhr und Sanskrit* (1902), pp 49 sq) the ruling speech of the people. No doubt the Mantra literature represents a poetic diction (cf Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt*, I, 38 sq) but it has not yet been made even plausible that contemporaneous with it were really Prakritic dialects, though no doubt in certain cases the tendencies which produced Prakrit were already in full force. The subsequent history ■ doubtless that of the more and more marked separation of the literary and the vulgar speech (cf Delbrück's neat summary of the history, *Altindisches Verbum*, pp 3 sq) and the place of the Epic must (it seems to me) be found either before the decay of speech had rendered the Sanskrit unintelligible to the warrior classes of the populace—and the Epic appears in origin to have been precisely like the Homeric Epic (see Lang, *Homar and His Age*, 1906) poetry composed by poets at the courts of princes who sang to the retainers and friends of their patron—not of course an epic of the lower classes or the mere cultivator, though he would understand it in part—or after the general revival of Sanskrit in the second and third centuries A.D. The latter view seems to raise more serious difficulties in our conception of the history of language and literature than ■ can pretend to solve. I still think the earliest epic (as distinguished from mere *dāhyanas* or *śāstas*) must date from the eighth to sixth centuries B.C. and be contemporaneous with the Brahmanas and Aranyakas, though of course in the case of both Mahābhārata and Rāmāyana extensive additions have been made by priestly hands in the two or three centuries before the Christian era. Only thus can a real place be found for Panina's *śāstra*, or for the customs of the Drama which must represent a real state of affairs when Sanskrit could be used by kings and nobles as intelligible to their inferiors. For what Kātyāyana spoke in the eighth to sixth centuries B.C. we have no evidence save the Brahmanas, where they speak Sanskrit, and the Epic, so far as we can regard it as contemporaneous. In view of the fact that Patañjali knew the Drama (*Ind Stud*, XIII, 456 sq), it seems only reasonable to assign to his period the separate use of Sanskrit and Prakrit for the different characters and either then or earlier the state of affairs must have been real. Nor is it possible to accept the theory of Lévi, Barth, and Gerson (*Ind Ant.*, XXIII, 110) that an originally Prakrit drama was turned into Sanskrit. This theory leaves no plausible explanation open of the use of Prakrit for some characters, since *ex hypothesis* both men and women equally used Prakrit in conversation, and, while it is quite intelligible that after the drama was an

3 'We choose that of Savitr' (RV, V, 82, 1-3) and 'O god, Savitr, this day' (RV, V, 82, 4-6), are the *strophe* and *antistrophe* (of the Vaisvadeva hymn¹) and are perfect in form as belonging to the one day ceremonial². Much indeed is done on this day that is forbidden and (the Vaisvadeva)³ is the atonement. Now atonement is rest, and so at the end (of the sacrifice) the sacrificers rest on the atonement of the one day (the Vaisvadeva) = their rest. He rests who knows this, and they also rest for whom the Hotr priest who knows this recites this Vaisvadeva. Then comes the Savitr hymn, 'Of Savitr, the god, this great and desirable thing' (RV, IV, 53). Great⁴ is the end. This day is the end. So the verse fits this day. Then comes the Dyāvā-Prthivī hymn, 'Which is the elder, which the younger' (RV, I, 185), in which (the verses) end alike⁵. This day is one on which (the sacrificers) end alike. So the hymn fits the day. Then comes the Rbhu hymn, 'Born not for steeds nor reins, worthy of praise' (RV, IV, 36). With regard to the words, 'The chariot of three wheels,' the hymn is possessed of three (*trīṇa*), and what is possessed of three⁶ is the end. This day is the end. So the hymn fits the day. The hymn, 'Of this benignant, greyhaired, priest' (RV, I, 164), addressed to

established fact it could remain popular long after it had ceased to be intelligible the popularity of a literary form *ex antio* unread is very strange. People in England would not go to Italian opera (which by the by is certainly understood by fifty per cent of the spectators), but for the fact that there was once and still is a popular drama in England.

Of course it cannot be contended—nor is it so claimed—that Sanskrit was ever the vernacular of the lower classes. What we have to conceive is rather a parallel series of languages diverging from vernaculars older than the Vedic of the earliest hymns, each current among certain portions of the people, but so their earlier stages intelligible to all. The Greek and English dialects gave a fair parallel, in both cases ending in a common form of educated and literary speech. Cf. Jacob *Z D M G*, XLVIII 407 sq.

¹ Cf. Sankhayana Āraṇyaka, II, 18, which differs in detail as usual. This section refers to the evening Soma pressing, when the Vaisvadeva and Āgṇimaruta Śāstras are recited, see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, V, 353, 354 n. 3, Eggeling *S B E* XLVI, 322, 361 (Vaisvadeva), 369 (Āgṇimaruta). Caland and Henry, *L'Agnistoma*, pp. 354 sq.

² The *prakṛti* is here the Vāṣṭi, and the *mukhaprakṛti* is the Agnistoma, as usual.

³ Cf. I, 2, 1. Sayana selects the two tristichs as the immediate point of reference.

⁴ Because greatness is the *me plus ultra* of all things (Sayana).

⁵ *udakta* is equal to *anta* in the one case and to *sitarakṣi eva dhruva phalaṇi* in the other, according to Śāyana. The sacrificers obtain *brahman*, he adds, but this is hardly meant. Most of the verses end alike in this and the following cases. Cf. for the word, Atareya Brāhmaṇa, V, 1, 3, 12.

⁶ This is not obvious. Sayana refers it to the case where two wheels are inadequate and a third is found necessary. This wheel, as before the *dīkṣ*, is the end, I, 5, 2. Zimmer (*Altindisches Leben*, pp. viii, ix) points out that *trivakra* in the Samhitās is merely an epithet of the cars of the Athiras where its sense is mythological and he therefore denies the existence of three wheeled cars in the Vedic period, but cf. Weber, *I. Ind. Stud.*, 1899, p. 364 n. 1.

the All gods, = multiform * This day = multiform So the hymn fits the day (Of what he recites) the end^a is, 'Forming the waters, the buffalo hath lowed' (RV, I, 164, 41) The hymn, 'May powers auspicious come to us on every side' (RV, I, 89) addressed to the All gods, is one containing an insertion, and is perfect in form as belonging to the one day ceremonial Much indeed is done on this day that is forbidden and (the hymn with the insertion^b) = the atonement Now atonement is rest, and so at the end (of the sacrifice) the sacrificers rest on the atonement of the one day (insertion) as their rest He rests who knows this, and they also rest for whom the Hotr priest who knows this recites the hymn with the insertion The verses 'To Vaisvanara, who strengthens law, our praise' (RV, III, 2, 1 sq) are the strophe of the Āgṇimāruta Śāstra Praise is the end This day is the end So the hymn fits the day The hymn, 'The Maruts, rushing onward, with gleaming lances' (RV, V, 55) addressed to the Maruts, is one in which (the verses) end alike This day = one in which (the sacrificers) end alike So the hymn fits this day He recites, before the next hymn, the verse, 'To Jātavedas let us pour the Soma' (RV, I, 99 1) addressed to Jātavedas The Jātavedas verse is welfare and wins welfare So he makes this into welfare The hymn, 'To Jātavedas, who deserves our praise' (RV, I, 94)^c addressed to Jātavedas, is one in which (the verses) end alike This day is one in which (the sacrificers) end alike So the hymn fits this day^d

^a It is of multifarious content as indeed is the case and is recognized in the Anuśramāṇa The day is multifarious because of its collection of Vedic mantras and popular elements like dancing

^b That is only forty one verses are to be taken Cf V, 3 2

^c The insertion is after the ninth verse, *visva devaḥ somasya mātān* (Scheffelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rigveda* p 137) &c.

^d On RV, I 94 see Oldenberg, *S B E* XLVI 108 sq

^e At the end Sayana observes that this ends the *karmakāṇḍa* of the Āraṇyaka The next two books are the *jñānakāṇḍa* or the Upaniṣad This regular opposition really of course means very little Both parts deal with *jñāna* and not with the performance of the rite, but the first Āraṇyaka does of course treat the rite in some detail, explaining its mystic significance, while the second Āraṇyaka diverges to speculations less closely associated with the actual Mantras of the ceremonial A more real opposition of *karma* and *jñāna* would be to oppose books V and I-III For the relation of *karma* and *jñāna* in Śāṅkara's view, see his commentary on Taittiriya Upaniṣad, I 22

In some MSS (see Crit Note) a summary of the chapters of each Āraṇyaka is given at the end For similar summaries, cf those of the Taittiriya Upaniṣad, Max Müller *S B E*, VI, xxviii, xxix, that in VIII, 3 of the Bauddhāyana Āraṇyaka and Hauskalt Upaniṣad, IV, 2

ARANYAKA II *vide p 40 (contin)*

ADHYĀYA 1

THIS is the path, this¹ is the sacrifice, this is *brahman*; this is truth. Therefore let no man diverge² from it, let no man transgress it. For they did not transgress it; of old, those that did transgress it were overcome. A RṢI³

¹ Sayana, following, as throughout this part of his commentary, Śaṅkara (cf Śaṅkara on Taittiriya Upaniṣad, I, 12, translated by S. Sataśima, *Upanishads*, V, 112-113), discusses the relation of the *karmakāṇḍa* and the Upaniṣad. His conclusion is that it is that of *sādhana* and *sādhyā* the sacrifices serving to purify the mind through the destruction of evil and the production of a desire for knowledge. He quotes and rejects the views (1) that knowledge is unnecessary, it being sufficient to give up all works good or evil, and to perform the various regular and occasional sacrifices, and to exhaust what one has begun by enjoying it, so that at death freedom is attained. He points out that it is not possible to abandon good and evil, such acts being endless, and that the sacrifices performed must bear fruits and the actions of previous births must produce many other births. (2) Others held that a union of knowledge and sacrifice is the cause of freedom. But knowledge is directly contradictory to sacrifice, since the latter involves the conception of the self as active, whereas the former recognizes that the self is *anurikṣa*. (3) Others hold that sacrifice is the ladder which beginning with the simplest and ending with the most complicated sacrificial rites leads to knowledge as the cause of freedom. Sayana points out life is too short for this. (4) Others think the *karmakāṇḍa* is used in a subsidiary manner, just as in catching cranes one throws cord on their heads and it muzzling blinds them, so one should sacrifice. The reply is that this is surplussage: one should catch one's crime straight off. The story is reminiscent of putting salt on the tail of a bird. (5) The use of sacrifice is to exhaust desire through the enjoyment of the desires produced by such acts but clearly it is replied, desire is not so quenched. Sayana also explains at length the *visaya*, *prayoga*, *adhikāra*, *prastāva* and *prayoga* of the system which he attributes to the Upaniṣad. Cf Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 57 sq., L. T., pp. 61 sq. 'This' means both what is just past and what is to come, and so Śāyana refers the *etat karmā* to Aranyaka I, and *etat brahma* to Aranyaka II and III. The latter alone is true.

² Sayana thus discriminates the divergence as due to mere laxness: the transgression to interest in other matters, ploughing or industry, or such forms of devotion as relic worship &c. For *pra + smad*, cf Taittiriya Upaniṣad, II, 5, I, 11, 2, Kāthaka Upaniṣad, II, 5, which support my emendation *prasmadant* in Śākhāyana Aranyaka, VII, 29.

³ The verse is of course absurdly construed. It is impossible on any theory to make much sense of it. As taken in the translation, the idea is that three peoples were ruined the others settled round Agni, in the sense that with Agni as their helper one people has been prosperous, the others not. Compare the view of the Śatapatha Brahmana, I, 4, 1, 10-12, that no country is civilized until Agni burns over it, Eggeking, *S B E*, VII, 211 sq., Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 214, 215. The last two verses of the stanza of course are hopeless, save as indicating vaguely the connexion between Agni, the Sun, and Vayu. The Atharvaveda, X, 8, 3, has a different version, see Whitney, *Translation*, p. 596.

says (RV, VIII, 101, 14), 'Three peoples transgressed Others settled round the sun The great one stands in the middle of the worlds The blowing one enters the dawns' In the verse, 'Three peoples transgressed,' the three peoples which transgressed are the Vayases,⁴ the Vangavagadhas, and the Cerapādas. In the

¹ Sayana and Ānandāsurtha agree in taking this as referring to the fates which in another life befell the three peoples who transgressed. The peoples are Brahmanas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras, and only one set was saved. The others suffer a *narakayāna* (cf for this idea Hopkins, *J R A S*, 1906, pp. 581 sq.), as birds, &c. Only they differ as to the meaning of the words *vayamsi vangavagadhāḥ* (*traṣṭāḥ*). Sayana renders them as birds, trees (*vanagaḥ śṛṣṭāḥ*), plants (*śvanti manvyaḥ* and *grdhraḥ* 'bhikṣuśānta'), and snakes (*uraḥ* *paśāḥ* *tarṣāḥ*). Ānandāsurtha prefers Phocas, Rākṣases (*vanga* is from *vam jānāmi* and *gamyanti*, and *magadha* from *grdha* *abhiśaṅkṣyam*), and Asuras. We are justified therefore in holding that there was no trustworthy tradition, and it is therefore possible to consider whether Max Müller's suggestion that the words are perhaps old ethnic names is correct. In its favour it may be noted that Sayana and Ānandāsurtha compel us to assume that the Āranyaka accepts the fullest form of the doctrine of transmigration as a punishment (e.g. *kaṇṭakā* Upaniṣad, I), which is a comparatively late view and which I do not think is found in this Upaniṣad. If they are ethnic names, then *Vayamsi* gives us a people like the Matsyas, Ajas, &c., in whose names we may, if we like, see totemism.⁵ The *Vangavagadhāḥ* are a composite tribe or group of tribes like the Kuru Pāñcalas, whose name reminds us of the later Vanga (known to Mahābhāṣya (Weber *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 386) and to Mahābhārata, Dharmasūtras, &c. in conjunction with Aṅga), as part of what is now Bengal. The *Cerapādaḥ* are a third tribe, whose name points to the later Ceras of Southern India. It is of course possible (cf Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, p. 31) to argue that these verses show a later date and a wider geographical knowledge than is compatible with the early pre-Buddhist date here attributed to the Āranyaka. But in this respect it may be observed that Rhys Davids (cf Bühler, *S B E*, II, xxv sq., *Ind. Ant.*, XVIII, 246-248, Weber, *ibid.*, XX, 273; *Z D M G*, XLIX, 479) presses unduly the argument from the Buddhist texts. There is in addition the grave doubt as to the age of the Buddhist texts (the possibility that these texts show only the regions where Buddhism had penetrated and that there were Brahmanical countries beyond these limits (cf Bühler, *Ind. Ant.*, XVIII, 245 sq., Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 254 sq., *Mañjuprāṣā*, I, p. xv). It may be questioned whether Buddhism early gained a direct hold on much of Southern India, at least there is no evidence that it ever did. Besides the question arises whether the Cerapādas must have been settled in the South at this date. It should be noted that the text says they were destroyed, and this may refer to a disaster in the old tribe, a remnant of which wandered south and later appear as the Ceras, who are known in the south as Aśoka and to Kātyāyana, Weber, I c., p. 371. Bhandarkar, *History of Deccan*, p. 143.

The version of Sāvana takes *cerapādaḥ* as *ca urapādaḥ*. This seems very unlikely because a single *ca* with the second of three connected words is not elsewhere found in this Āranyaka, and is nowhere common (For examples cf RV, I 77, 2 (Oldenberg *S B E*, XLII, 101) and Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 475.) It is, I think, much more likely that three names of defeated tribes should not appear in the precise forms here found elsewhere than that names of plants and beasts should so disappear. At any rate they must all three be plants and

⁴ More animal names, *rywe* little as to totemism, which is not demonstrated for any Aryan stock, cf Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States* IV, 116, 256, Macdonell, *Ind. Myth.*, p. 123. Hopkins, *P A O S*, 1894 p. cliv, Keith *J R A S*, 1907, pp. 929 sq., Bühler, *Ind. Stud.*, III, 48

verse, 'Others settled round the sun,'¹ these people are settled round Agni here, as the sun. In the verse, 'The great one stands in the middle of the worlds,' that great one in the middle of the worlds means this sun. In the verse, 'The blowing one enters the dawns,' the meaning is the purifying air enters the quarters.²

2 People³ say, 'Hymn, hymn.'⁴ The hymn is indeed the earth.⁵ For from it all that exists springs. It praises Agni. Food are its eighty verses,⁶ for by food one obtains all. The hymn is the sky. For (birds) fly along the sky, and along the sky men drive. It praises Vāyu. Food are its eighty verses, for by food one obtains all. The hymn is also yonder heaven. For by

animals or names of tribes. Monier Williams' *Dict* takes *vanga* as plants, *svagadha* and *cervapada* as names of peoples, which is quite impossible. Dr Schiefelowitz in his forthcoming *Zur Stammbildung in den indogermanischen Sprachen* (which he has been so good as to show me in MS) considers that *vanga* is formed from *van* by the suffix *ga* (when *g = gu*). He compares *madgu* (not for **mag* but from *√mad + ga*), *khadga*, *phalga*, *stargā*, *targa*, *phalgā*, *lunga*, *stnga*, *drdhaga*, *ulig*, *venig*, *sphig*, *dāga* (not = *IG + gū*) &c. But even if this is the case the origin of the word throws no light on its being used as a tribal name, nor do I feel sure of the equation *vanga* = tree. Possibly *va ga* *Magadhā* may be read, cf my *Saṅkhyāna Āraṇyaka*, p. 46 n. 4, *Baudhayana Dharma Sūtra*, I, 2, 13 and 14.

The citation of the R̥gvedic verse in full is of course natural when an explanation is being given. So verses are cited and explained in full at II, 1, 6 (RV, I, 164, 31) II, 1, 8 (RV, I, 164, 38), II, 3, 1 (RV, IV, 27, 1) III, 1, 6 (RV, V, 114, 4) III, 2, 3 (RV, I, 113, 1). In the last case the verse is cited entire to indicate the sense desired to be understood. So also verses are cited in full in the *Saṅkhyāna Āraṇyaka*, VII, 15, 18, 20, V III 4, 6, IX, 15, VII, 8, 35.

¹ Anandātīrtha, here and throughout interprets in a Vaiṣṇava sense. *arkam* is *Viṣṇu* *Āditya* is *Vṛṇu*, and *taishan* is *upastam cakra*. To Sayana, *arkam* is Agni *ahavaniya*.

² Sayana justifies this by *pratyadishah tattatkarmanu tatstatah satya nūthanavasthāyam karanti*.

³ Sayana explains, following the Mimamsa, III, 4, IV 1, III 3, that the purpose of *Āraṇyaka*, II 1, 3 is to enable men to attain concentration of thought by meditating on things connected with the sacrifice. There are five principles in such meditation: (1) The meditation falls on the lot not of the *yajurians* but of the *ṛṣi*. (2) The meditation must be on the *pratīka*s of the hymns as deities like earth &c., and not vice versa. (3) If the *dāyana* is prescribed for a certain thing only in one Śikha, it can nevertheless be taken over by another Śikha e.g. by the *haustakins*. (4) It is not obligatory in every case to go through all the forms of meditation which are prescribed in connexion with any part of the rite. It is sufficient to make the choice desired. (5) Nor is it necessary to adopt the meditation along with the sacrifice as an essential part. It is a matter of choice.

The last rule shows the manner in which the Brahmins avoided the open rejection of sacrifice and yet justified their own speculations as a practical substitute for sacrifice.

⁴ That is, not knowing its secret reference. Sayana follows the *Āraṇyaka* in deriving *utkām* from *ut + kām*. Anandātīrtha, of course, explains the whole by the doctrine that *Viṣṇu* is omnipresent and so all things can be identified with him and through him with one another. Cf *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaśad*, V, 13, 1 (where *utkāṣṭhaya* is the derivation of *utkām*), *haustaki Upaśad*, III 3.

⁵ The three acts of elating, tainting, in *gatra brāhmi*, and *manā* V, 2, 3, 4, 5.

its gift all that exists springs. It praises the sun. Food are its eighty verses, for by food one obtains all. So much as regards the gods. Now as regards the self. The hymn is man. He is great and is Prajāpati. Let him know that he is the hymn.⁴ The hymn is his mouth, is in the case of the earth. It praises speech. Food are its eighty verses, for by food one obtains all. The hymn is the nostrils, as in the case of the sky. It praises breath. Food are its eighty verses, for by food one obtains all. The bend of the nose⁵ as it were is the place of the brilliant one. The hymn is the forehead,⁶ as in the case of the heaven. It praises the eye. Food are its eighty verses, for by food one obtains all. The eighty verses are food both with reference to the gods and with reference to the self, for by food all these beings breathe⁷, by food⁸ he conquers this world and by food that world. Therefore the eighty verses are food both with reference to the gods and to the self. The food and the feeder are the earth, for all that exists springs from it. Whatever goes forth, (heaven) consumes it all⁹. Whatever goes thence, the (earth) consumes it all. So earth is both food and feeder. He¹⁰ becomes feeder and food. He is lord of nothing that he eats not, or that eats him not.

⁴ Sayana points out that this contradicts the Mīmāṃsā, see *Brahma Sūtra*, IV, 1, 3, 4, but solves the contradiction by saying the first view rests on *nyayabalaḥ*, that here on *eo amo balat, him roa ā vacanam na kuryon waste vacanasyaśāhara etī ā īśtrokaranam dandmah* *Vidyā* it here means *dīkṣyet* once both knowledge and meditation are concerned with mind (*jñānādhyāsayor manatattatāmjina*).

⁵ The reference is to the bend just below the brow where the nose springs out. Sayana cites the *Jabāla Upaniṣad* II *astamam vārya itthonam bhavati* | *śrutev prānasya ca yuḥ sandhāḥ* (see *bandhāḥ* R?) *sa eva dyāvuritāḥvāya parasya sandhīr bhavati* | This refers to *brahman*, so *Āditya*, who is *brahman*, is here an *upāśrūṭ* of *brahman*. *Ānandaurītha* takes *roa* as meaning *kimci* | while Sayana says it is equal to *eva* or has no meaning. Cf. I, 1, 2, III 2 6.

⁶ *śiṣṭavarāṇītha* says *śaśaśābādhina caktur grhyate*. The word, found in the *Aitharavedy*, V, 2, 8 properly denotes 'brow' or 'superciliary ridge'. See *Hoenle Outledge* pp. 221 sq, 227 sq.

⁷ The *śruti* with the nasal is *uktoraśprastidhyartha* says Sayana. The next *pred* *sau nam* is noteworthy, see *Delbrück*, *1 ergi Syntax*, III, 247, 248.

⁸ By giving food to retainers and by sacrifice respectively.

⁹ Sayana and *Ānandaurītha* take this as referring to the doctrine of transmigration. But this is hardly necessary. The earth consumes what the heaven sends, e.g. rain, not persons who are born again, or as Sayana says, sacrificers who having enjoyed heaven after death return again to earth. It is not proved that such an idea is known to this *Āranyaka*. Cf. II 1, 1, n 4, 3, n 5, 3, 2, n 3, 7, 2, 5, 8, n 15, 4, 2, n 1, 5, on 6, 2, 9. For the use of *prerita* (for the form, cf. *Oldenberg*, *S B E* XLVI 2, *Banholme*, *Iran. Grundr*, I 54, 70) as *prerita* Sayana has reference to the analogy of *pra + √a*. The form of the *śruti* is that laid down in *Parāś* VIII, 2, 207, cf. *Wackernagel Altindische Grammatik*, I, 298 sq.

✓ ¹⁰ This is very obscure. There seems little doubt, however, that it is intended as the expression of a vague pantheism. Cf. Emerson's 'I am the doubter and the doubt. And I the hymn the Brahmin sings.' The priest identifies himself with the hymn and also with Prajāpati (see above), and so becomes as Max Müller says subject and object in one.

3. Then comes¹ the origin of seed. The seed of Prajāpati are the gods.* The seed of the gods is rain. The seed of rain is herbs. The seed of herbs is food. The seed of food is seed. The seed of seed is creatures. The seed of creatures is the heart.² The seed of the heart is the mind.³ The seed of the mind is speech. The seed of speech = action.⁴ The act done is this

Ānandatiltha interprets it that Viṣṇu consumes all worlds, and all beings enjoy him, which is the same idea attached to the name of Viṣṇu. Śaṅkara contrasts the *uśīṣaka* and the *anūśīṣaka* and explains the matter slightly differently in the last sentence as meaning that other men do not enjoy him (*yad rā-jasmāc ca kāraṇat*). He reconciles this with the fact that he is *ādyaś* because that refers to *śrīmadbhūtasarvabhogajalārūpaṇi*. This explanation = not probable, but undoubtedly the construction of the last words contains a serious difficulty = *yad* cannot correspond to *ādyaś*. The fact perhaps is that *yad* is used for formal correspondence with the previous *yad* though it is not quite parallel in construction. It must be taken literally as an accusative of point in which—'or in so much as they do not consume him'. For the metaphor of Jaliniya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 2: *anādyamāno yad adantam aṭṭa*; Taittirīya Upaniṣad, II, 2: *adyate 'tā ca dhātanti*; III, 7, 9, &c.; Śaṅkara Brāhmaṇa, X, 6, 2; XII, 9, 1; Maitrāyaṇi Samhitā, I, 10, 13; Kausitaki Brāhmaṇa, XI, 3; A. S. P., XX, 426, and the Puruṣa Sūktā. Another possible explanation, however, is suggested by Jaliniya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 5, 3: *sa (satyam as devatā) ha tasya neta yad enam aparidhat*, 'She is not able to drive him away,' where *yad* is a conjunction. So here the exact sense may be, 'He cannot help eating them and their eating him'; *tasya* being used to introduce the dependent clause. Cf. II, 1, 5, n. 5. No doubt originally *yad* was a relative, but the pronominal quality is clearly minimal in such cases. The opt. in such a case is one of consequences or characteristic, cf. *brāhmaṇam kuryān ya pātyet*, III, 2, 3, n. 3. So I would explain Rāmāyaṇa, III, 19, 7: *na hi pātyāny aham iṣte ya kuryān mama upayam*, which Speyer (*Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 371) explains (see § 193, 4) as merely indefinite. But the sense is slightly different from = mere indefinite. So Bhāṣārāṇyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 2, 23: *ad tū tād drśyam asti tū nāyā tīkṣṇam yā pātyet*, *ibid.*, 24-30, &c.

¹ Śaṅkara says this section is intended to explain the greatness of *puruṣa*, mentioned in II, 1, 2. Ānandatiltha, on II, 1, 2, much more correctly says: *vidyāntaratnam na puruṣakhandenīya sametāḥ (uttarātrasya tad anuśīṣakam)*. Cf. Pischel, *Veilsche Studien*, I, III sq.

² Śaṅkara says that the element of *satva* is represented in the gods, of *raja* in men, and of *tamas* in animals, &c., and this explains the high position here given to the gods. This doctrine is of course later, appearing first most clearly in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, see Deussen, *Philosophie der Upaniṣads*, pp. 226 sq.; E. T., pp. 250 sq.; Garbe (*Simhāyastotra-kāṇḍī*, p. 591) has conclusively, I think, dispersed the assumption counteracted by Weber (*Ind. Stud.*, IV, 11), Muir (*Texts*, V, 309), and Whitney (*Translation of Atharvaveda*, p. 601) that Atharvaveda, A, 8, 43 refers to the *gunas*, see Lammé, *ibid.*, p. 1043.

³ Because the *śivātman* is here, says Śaṅkara. Cf. Deussen, op. cit., p. 259; E. T., p. 257.

⁴ Ānandatiltha distinguishes *Arāgya* and *manas* as being *śambhūti* and *anābhūti* respectively. Śaṅkara's explanation is much more probable that *manas* denotes the knowing part of the heart, a frequent early use of the word, cf. Deussen, op. cit., pp. 243 sq.; E. T., pp. 250 sq.

⁵ Śaṅkara renders speech as the Veda, and action as sacrifice. Ānandatiltha evidently takes it as equal to *adentam kuryā rā*. He also (unlike Śaṅkara) constructs *karmakṛtam* = one word, *karmakṛtismam*. Ānandatiltha points in the text *karmakṛtam* against the commentary. Śaṅkara of course explains *Arāgya* as done in a former birth, but this again is an unnecessary intro-

man, the abode of *brahman*. He consists of food * and because he consists of food, he consists of gold. He becomes golden¹ in yonder world, he is seen as golden for all mortals, who know this.

* 4 *Brahman*² entered into that man by the tips of his feet. Because *brahman* entered that man by the tips of his feet, so men call them the tips of the feet (*prapadāla prapode*), but in the case of other animals hoofs and claws. Then he crept higher up, and they became the thighs. Then he said, 'Swallow³ widely,' and that became the stomach. Then he said, 'Make it wide for me,' and that became the chest. The Śākarākṣyas⁴ mediate on the stomach as *brahman*, the Ārunis on the heart. These two are indeed *brahman*. But he crept upwards still, and arrived at the head. Because he arrived at the head (*afraṇāla*) then it became the head (*siras*). So the head is the head. These delights settled in the head, sight, hearing, mind, speech, breath. Delights settle on him who

duction of the transmigration theory, see II, 1, 1, 2, 4, 2, 2, 9 and Anandātīrtha does not accept it. The passage only means that action is the man, the man is what he does, a perfectly plausible view. For the relation of speech and action see Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 33, 4, II, 3, 8, III, 33, 9, Mahanarayana Upaniṣad, IV, 7, Oertel *J A O S*, XVI, 231.

¹ Anandātīrtha renders *sa* as *bhāgatan* and *iramayāḥ* as *ichamuruparubhāgurnah* and *īranmayāḥ* as *īdhyānandatīkṣmasubhāgurnah*. Sayana quotes Taittiriya Upaniṣad, II, 1, 1 *sa va esa furuṣa annarasaṁmayāḥ*. He explains that as man is composed of food so he is gold in the shape of the egg of Brahman. Really the thing is a mere play on words. For the form *īran(3a)mayāḥ*, cf. Bloomfield, *P A O S*, April, 1893 p. xxxv, *A J P*, X, 11, 418, Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 279. Also, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 38.

² Anandātīrtha explains *Narayanam yanan karmajam rupam uttrījya nyānandaśāstrupale bhavati*. Sayana says he appears as golden as the sun for the benefit of all creatures. Really it means, he appears (*dadṛśe* passive of *Delbrück Altindische Syntax*, pp. 264, 29) to all creatures no doubt originally as the sun. The passage is like all this part of the Āranyaka II, 1-3, pantheistic. In Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa X, 1, 4, 9, the Agni is promised birth in the other world as *īranmayāḥ*, rendered by Sayana *īranpāsanamanovarnah* see Eggeling *S B E*, XLIII 295, 8, 2.

³ Sayana explains that this chapter shows *prana*, the *śraddhā* of Brahman, entering the subtle body. His entry into the gross body is seen on II, 2, 2. He compares Taittiriya Upaniṣad, II, 6, 1. Maṭṭrayaniya Upaniṣad II. For *prapad*: Lanman in Whitney *Translation of Atharvaveda*, II, 33, 5 suggests *toe* as the meaning, but the dual renders that impossible here, and I believe in all the passages cited at p. xxviii the sense 'front part of the foot' as opposed to 'heel' is correct.

⁴ Make a large hole, says Sayana. Max Müller's 'grasp' is a slip. The form is overlooked in the *Text* and in Whitney's *Texts*, &c.

⁵ Śākarākṣyaḥ is rendered *sakṣmasāstrīyāḥ* by Anandātīrtha, who, however, calls the *Arumayāḥ* Rūṣ. He explains *śūdrām* as locative in sense as does Sayana, tacitly. The Śākarākṣyas are a subdivision of the Hāndrayas according to the Caranayāḥ and are mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya, IV, 1, 74, 75. Max Müller points out that neither in Chandogya Upaniṣad, V, 11, 25, 27 nor in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa X, 6, 1, do these views appear—at least in terms. *Arumayāḥ* appears also in Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa II, 5, 1 wrongly amended by Oertel to *Arumayāḥ*, against the MSS. *brahman* may be meant but the next is more likely Cf. Weber, *Ind Stud* XVIII 140, v. Schroeder *Ind Lit*, p. 91, n. 3. That the heart (*Arūṇā*) is *brahman* was the view of Viśvaghna Śāhalya see Yājñavalkya's exposition in Bhāṭṭaranyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 1, 7. See also Chandogya Upaniṣad, III, 12, 4, VIII 2, 3 *Ind Stud*, II 177.

knows thus why the head is the head They strove together,* saying, 'I am the hymn, I am the hymn' They said, 'Come, let us leave this body, then that one of us at whose departure the body falls, will be the hymn' Speech went forth, yet (the body) remained, speechless, eating and drinking Sight went forth, yet (the body) remained, sightless, eating and drinking Hearing went forth, yet (the body) remained, without hearing, eating and drinking Mind went forth, yet (the body) remained, blinking as it were,* eating and drinking. Breath went forth, when breath went out, (the body) fell It was decayed. (Because men) said it had decayed, it became the body Therefore in the body the body Who knows this, his enemy, the evil one, who hates him decays, the enemy, the evil one, who hates him is defeated They strove together, saying, 'I am the hymn, I am the hymn' They said, 'Come, let us again enter this body, then that one of us, on whose entrance the body rises, will be the hymn' Speech entered, (the body) lay still Sight entered, (the body) lay still Hearing entered, (the body) lay still Mind entered, (the body) lay still Breath entered, (the body) arose, and (breath) became the hymn Therefore breath only is the hymn Let men know that breath is the hymn The gods* said to breath, 'Thou art the hymn, thou art all this, we are thine, thou art ours' A Rsi says (RV, VIII, 98, 32), 'Thou art ours, we are thine'

* There are similar passages in Bhādarāyaka Upaniṣad, VI, 2, Chāndogya Upaniṣad, V, 1, Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad II 12-14, III, 2, Prāśna Upaniṣad, II, 1. The comparative antiquity of the versions must be open to doubt. But this version certainly seems simpler and more original than those of the Bhādarāyaka, Chāndogya, or Kauṣītaki Upaniṣads, which seem to embellish the theme with further details. The account in the Prāśna Upaniṣad is ample, but as that Upaniṣad is on other grounds late, that may be explained as merely a reference to a well known theme, and indicates the danger of arguments from comparative simplicity. For *Śaṅkha* with subj., cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 23-43, Aufrecht *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 430.

* The masculine, *mūṣa*, is explained by Sayana as referring to *deśa* understood. It is probable that the idea in the mind of the writer throughout was *puruṣa* as the subject, hence the masculines as long as *puruṣa* remains in the *śaṅkha*. *śaṅkha* is Brāhmaṇa style first. Cf. Bhādarāyaka Upaniṣad, I, 4, 11 and 12 (2, 22 and 3 in the Madhyandina text) where *brāhma* is followed by *sa*. On the other hand in Bhādarāyaka, IV, 3, 22, the *śaṅkha* text, after a series of masculines, produces *anantagataṃ puruṣaṃ*, and Śaṅkara explains *rupaparivṛtan naṣṭamāhātugam*. The Madhyandina version (as in Weber and Böhtlingk) has the masc., but as Max Müller (*S B E*, XV, 169) points out, Nirvedaganga had *anantagataṃ* as he says *anantagataṃ ite rūpavṛtayo naṣṭamāhātugam*. There are also difficulties in the genders in Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, III, 7, see Max Müller, *S B E*, XV, 245, n. 4. In Śaṅkhyāna Āraṇyaka, VII, 22, *hamarūṣa* and *hamarāṣa*, according to one MS, agree with *brāhma*. Such uses are not rare in Latin and Greek, e.g. *phle rīvov*, *Vergil Syntax*, III, 244. For its 3, cf. *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, VII, 22, 2, against Böhtlingk, *Sachs Ber*, 1890, p. 170.

* The gods are those presiding over the parts of the body, see II, 1, 5, n. 3. For Prāśna as *brāhma*, cf. Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, II, 1, 2, Chāndogya Upaniṣad, IV, 10, 5, Taittirīya Upaniṣad, III, 3, 1, Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 33, 2. It was held by Uśāṅka Śaṅkhyāna (Bhādarāyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 1, 2) and is refuted, ibid., V, 13, 1, Oertel, *J A O S*, XVI, 230.

5 The gods carried him forward¹. Being carried forward he was stretched out (Because men say) he has been carried forward, the morning came into being. (Because men say) he has gone to rest, the evening came into being. Day is breathing forth,² night is breathing down. Speech is fire,³ sight yonder sun, mind the moon, hearing the quarters, this is the union⁴ of those sent forth. These deities are such in the body, but they openly appear among the deities, this is the meaning. This indeed said Hiranyadant Vaidā who knew this, 'Whatever they give me not,⁵ I own not myself. I know the union of those sent forth in the body which they enter. This it is.' To him who

¹ Sayana explains that this section treats of *prāṇa* under various forms. Ānandabṛhha at times equates *prāṇa* and *vāyu*. The section is composed of bad etymologies. The first alludes to *pra + √ni* (*pra anayanta*).

² For the meanings of *prāṇa* and *apāṇa* see Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 249-251, E. T., pp. 276-279. The oldest view is that they mean expiration and inspiration respectively, whence *apāṇa* comes to refer to the wind of digestion. Cf. I, 3, 7, 4, 1, II, 3, 3.

³ This idea originates with the Purusa Sūtra, RV, X, 90, 13, 14, see Deussen, *Allgemeine Einführung*, p. 157, and later it develops into a regular system of gods who correspond to and guard the several psychic faculties. Cf. Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, p. 241, E. T., p. 267. It is developed most in II, 4, 1, 2, where Agni, &c., becomes speech, &c., and enter man, while here they are merely considered as the several parts of the body. Cf. also I, 3, 3, Śaṅkharāya Āranyaka, X and XI, *Lauman, Hindu Pantheism*, p. 18.

⁴ The idea seems clearly to be that these four are gathered together in the body, and exist openly as deities as Sayana says. But *prākṛit* is very difficult and the whole seems an explanation of what was even then obscure. Cf. the varying versions of *puruṣa apravartī, anṛtaḥ satyaḥ clannan* &c., cited in Deussen op. cit. p. 20, E. T., p. 20, n. 3.

⁵ This authority occurs also in Aitareya Brāhmaṇa III, 6. Is his name a reference to gold stoppings in his teeth? They were known to the XII Tables (n. c. 450?) and to very early Egypt. *Jam* is read by Rajendralala and in the Ānandasrama edition and also by Sayana. But it seems obvious that it stands for *jam* written before *m* carelessly as *annam*, cf. Max Müller, *Arari Hymns*, p. 12, II, 3, 3 n. 2, III, 1, 4, n. 3, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 62, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 313. To Sayana *jam* presents no difficulty as he merely supplies *padarthāḥ abhī jam*. The word *dadyuk* is difficult because the plural is unexpected after *ī* if that is a third person, when the sense would be 'nobody owns what the deities give not to me'. This is rather awkward but not impossible. The rendering of II, 1, 1 suggested in n. 10 there would give in this passage (though *jam* would still remain properly a pronoun), 'He owns nothing that they will not give me also,' which by an easy process of development would slide over into the sense, 'He cannot help them giving me (it),' showing the origin of such a developed construction as that in II, 1, 2. This comes to an assertion of the fact that all that the cosmic *puruṣa* has (he must be the subject of *ī*), that has man. It is simpler to neglect the commentators and take *ī* as first person, thus asserting the intimate union of man and the deities. In this use *jam* is used with consecutive force, cf. the Mantra use of *gad* as final with subj. or opt. (Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 321, 341), and the classical use (Speyer, *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 466). The absence of such a use in the Brāhmaṇas (cf. Speyer, *Indische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 279 c) is improbable. *ī* as a third person belongs to a type which occurs in all Brāhmaṇas, and is not a mere imitation of Mantra forms (as held by Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 419, where see other examples), see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 613. The form *prākṛit* presents great

knows this all creatures unconstrained pay homage That is *sātya* (truth)
 'For *sat* is breath, *it* is food, *yam* is yonder sun That is threefold Threefold
 as it were is the eye, white, dark, and the pupil' Even though he speaks
 falsely,* yet speaks he truth who thus knows why truth is *sātya*

6 Speech = his rope, names the knots¹ So by his speech as rope, and by
 names as knots, all this is bound For all this is names, and by his speech
 he names everything. Men² bound with ropes carry him who knows this His
 hairs are the *uśhā*, his skin the *gajātri*, his flesh the *tristubh*, his sinews the
anustubh, his bones the *jagati*, his marrow the *pankti*, his breath³ the *brhātī*
 He is covered with the metres Since he is covered with the metres, therefore
 they call them metres (coverings) Thus the metres cover him from ilhap⁴ in

difficulty To take it as Vedic for *prahīstanam* as Sayana does is to introduce a very rare
 form (cf Whitney, l c, p 114) into the text on the other hand the word *prahī* has no parallel
 (save conceivably in form (*Ind Stud.*, III, 225) in *prahītaś samyojan* in the *Ariseya Brahmana*, if
 we may take that as dual form gen. and not as in Monier Williams' *Dict* as a gen. of *prahītu*) at any
 rate in sense Whitney (*Roots* etc., p 202) gives *hī* as a form from *h*: I think that *prahī* should
 probably be taken as the 'impeller', i.e. the desires cause the organs to work, cf. II, 4 1, and 2
 ✓ The *i* of *it* is to enable it to be pronounced (Sayana). Chandogya Upanisad, VIII, 3,
 5 gives a different version, from *sat + it + yam*, as the binding of the immortal and the
 mortal (*it* being the dual of *it*) Cf Deussen cited in n 4 above Taittiriya Upanisad, II, 6,
 derives *sat ityam* from *sat* 'manifest', and *ityam* 'not manifest' Bhādarāyaka Upanisad V,
 5 1, gives *sat + it* (so Śaṅkara (as here) but *haṅga* text, *it*) + *am* when *sa* and *am* are = true,
 and *i* (*it*) = untrue (for *i* occurs in *anṛta* and *arītya*) Kausitaki Upanisad, I, 6, gives,
sat (what is other than the gods and the senses) + *ityam* (the gods and the senses)

¹ Cf Jaiminiya Brahmana, I 254 (*śaṅkṣāḥ*), Śatapatha Brahmana, XII, 8, 2, 25, *A J P.*
 XVII 400, elsewhere *purusa* is the third member, Jaiminiya Upanisad Brahmana I, 26 1, 34,
 1 and Oertel's note

✓ ² This doctrine undoubtedly shows the moral disadvantages of the doctrine of salvation by
 knowledge, and it is the precursor of the later immunity from moral censure of the *apramāṇika*
 Cf Kausitaki Upanisad III 1 Śaṅkara Vedāntasūtra, 23, *śubhāśubhāyoraṇḍam*
 and Jacob's note in his *Translation*, Lévi *La Doctrine du Sacrifice* pp. 164 167 In *aya* the
 genitive is presumably possessive cf Delbück *Altindische Syntax* § 153, Franke *Be Beitr.*
 XVI, 112, Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax* §§ 69 92, n, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*,
 § 296 b Compare *etam me satam* with *it* *naḥ* *brūhī* (*Introd.*, p 57), *J A O S.*, XLV,
 116 117 For the position of *Z D M G.*, LXII, 129

³ Sayana explains the metaphor from a rope for tying up cattle Ānandāśrītha explains
 as usual by identifying all with Viṣṇu ⁴ His refers to *prana* of course

⁵ Like oxen who carry men.

⁶ *prana* here refers to the air or the subtle sense, and has not the wider sense of *prāṇa*
 (Sayana), perhaps it = *Aranya*, as in II, 3, 7, and often, cf my *Saṅkhyāyana Aranyaka*, p 21

⁷ This must be the sense Sayana however appears to render it whatever evil he desires
 to do, the metres keep him from contact with it⁸ The connexion of *śāśad* and *chāśad* is very
 doubtful, see I 1, 3 n 6, Leumann, *Et Hist.*, p 103

⁸ See also RV, IV, 2 3 and 11 *marutam*, VI, 47, 16 *manuṣya*, Oldenberg, *S B F.*,
 XVI, 319, Pischel, *Indische Studien*, I, 44 Bartholomae, *Studien*, I, 48

whatever quarter he desires who knows thus why metres are called metres. A Rsi says (RV, I, 164, 13), 'I saw the guardian,' for he is a guardian, for he guards all this 'Never tiring,' for he never rests 'Coming and going on his ways,' for he comes and goes on his ways 'Illuminating' the principal and intermediate,' for he illuminates these quarters only, the principal and intermediate: 'He moves up and down in the worlds,' for he moves up and down in the worlds. Then there is the verse' (RV, I, 55, 8), 'Covered' like caves by the makers' For all this is covered by breath. This ether is supported by breath as *brhātī*, and one should know that, even as this ether is covered by breath as *brhātī*, so all things including ants are covered by breath as *brhātī*.

7. Now come the powers of this person. By his speech are created earth and fire. On the earth plants grow; fire ripens them. 'Take this, take this,' thus saying do these two, earth and fire, serve their parent, speech. As far as the earth extends, as far as fire extends, so far extends his world, and as long as the world of earth and fire decays not, so long does his world decay not who knows thus the power of speech. By breath the sky and the air are created. People follow the sky, and hear along the sky, and the air bears

* The verse, says Sayana. He explains that *prāna* is the guardian by referring to Kaustika Upaniṣad III, 2 *gotad(hy)aimā rharve prāno vasete taved ayur*. This passage of the Rgveda later served as the authority for the activity of *prāna* even in *saṃpṛa*, Prāna Upaniṣad, IV, 3, Deussen *Philosophie der Upanishads*, p. 268, L. T. p. 297. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 17, takes the *prāna* and the suna rays as meant.

* The four quarters and the four intermediate quarters SE, SW, NE, and NW. For the number of the quarters, at first four, later ten, cf. Hophins, *J. A. O. S.*, XVI, 283. *Prāna*, Sayana explains, is internally what *Āditya* is externally, see Prāna Upaniṣad, I 3, III, 8 *a liṭṭe ha tas bāhyā prāna udayata*. In the original and in Jaiminīya Upaniṣad l.c., *tas* means 'wears'.

* Not RV, I, 55 III (Max Müller following Rādhakṛṣṇa), nor I, 56, 8 (Ānandārama series).

* Ānandatīrtha and Śāyana both cite and explain quite differently, the whole verse, but they agree in taking the caves as holes for concealing wealth. Cf. I, 3, 1, n. 4.

* Ānandatīrtha renders, 'beginning with ants'.

* In the nose, i.e. the power of smell (Śāyana). The use of the mass *ispīṣu* with a mass and a neut. and of *ispīṣ* below do not entirely agree with the rules of concord later accepted. Delbrück (*Altindische Syntax*, p. 88) gives only one doubtful example (RV, I, 8, 10) and Speyer (*Pedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 101) thinks that in classical Sanskrit with names of things the neuter is a more common predicate if the genders differ and one is neuter. This is laid down in a Vārtika (not in the *Āṣṭika* Vṛtti, it appears) on Pāṇini, I, 2, 72, which runs *tyadaditah heta gunapumsakato hagaracanant* | *sā ca Devadattā ca tam* | *tac ca Devadattā ca* | *jayādattā ca tam* | *tac ca Devadattā ca* || So the neuter appears in Mahābhārata III, 58, 10, VI G 26, Rāmāyana VI 62, 37. If only persons are concerned the mass. is regular, e.g. Mahābhārata, VII, 1, 29 *Pinḍava eva mahatmāna Draupadi ca yajārvant* | *krīṣṭa anṣh* | *Auravya prajāyuk* | *prānukṣiṣṭa* | *tatā* || Raghuvamśa III, 23 *tatā nṛpa* | *sā mātara* | *Māgadhī nanandātā* | *tadārtāna* | *tatāman*, &c. That this is old is indicated by the rule in Homeric Greek, thus formulated by Monro (*Homeric Grammar*, p. 157), 'Where an adjective

pure scent² Thus do sky and air serve their parent, breath As far as the sky extends, as far as air extends, so far extends his world, and as long as the world of sky and air decays not, so long does his world decay not who knows thus the power of breath By his eye are created the heaven and the sun Heaven gives him rain and proper food, the sun causes his light to shine. Thus do heaven and sun serve their parent, the eye As far as the heaven extends, as far as the sun extends, so far extends his world, and as long as the world of heaven and sun decays not, so long does his world decay not who knows thus the power of the eye By his ear were created the quarters and the moon From the quarters they come unto him, from the quarters he hears, the moon produces for him the bright and the dark halves for good deeds³ Thus the quarters and the moon⁴ serve their parent, the ear. As

refers to more than one noun, it follows the most prominent or (if this is at all doubtful) the masc is used of persons the neut of things e.g., II 11 136 —

ὅ, ὅτι ποτὶ ἡλείων τ' ἰσχυρὸν καὶ ὑψηλὸν τέτυκται
ἥτα ἰὲρ μεγροῖς κοινόμενα,

because the wives are chiefly thought of, but Od XII, 434 —

ἀμφὶ δὲ μὲν βασιλὸς ἄλλοι κούρην βέλτερον ἢδὲ χερσὶνα,
βουγάλην θυσίοντα

The neut plur is especially used of sheep and cattle II 11, 244 —

πρὸς ἐνδοξὸν βοῶν δῶκεν, ἐπειρὰ δὲ χυλὰ ὕεισσε,
αἵματι δ' αὖτις καὶ ὄσσε

The first example shows that a fem can prevail over a neut in the case of persons, the second that in regard to things the neut prevails over the masc, the third that in regard to things the neut may be used of masc and fem animals Here *ausaraktam* is a deity and so naturally the masc prevails cf Monn, VIII, 86, where *Ardayam* is personified In Latin the rule is (Allen and Greenough, *Latin Grammar*, p 273), generally, a predicative adjective will be masculine, if nouns of different genders mean *living beings* neuter, *if things without life* as Livy II, 40 *uxor deinde ac liberi amplexu*, but Livy 4, 4 *labor voluptasque societate quadam inter se naturalis sunt iuncta* Even if masc nouns and fem occur, the neut. can be used if one of the subjects is a thing, e.g., Livy 31v, 24 *natura humana sunt libera celsas et res*, or even if two fem nouns represent things, e.g. Cicero, *de Fin* III, 18 *stultitia et temeritas et inconstitia sunt fugienda* The basis of discrimination, therefore, is rather between living creatures especially persons, and things (which include sometimes the animals)

The use of the dual and plural of the verb is regular, cf Delbrück, pp 83 sq; Speyer, 1 c, though as in Greek and Latin and Anglo-Saxon the nearest subject may determine the verb, as is usual in the Bhaddedeṭṭa Cf ibid., VII, 74 for a set of mixed genders with a neut plur., VIII, 47, for a masc plur with a masc sing., a fem sing., and a masc dual, which follow Cf Delbrück, *Vergl Syntax*, III, 241-247, which this supplements

² Sayana refers to Bhādarāmyāla Upaniṣad, I, 3, and Chandogya Upaniṣad, I, 2, for the reasons, interference by Asuras, for the existence of bad smells, cf Farnell, *Evolution of Religion*, pp. 99 sq. Ānandāśrītha takes 'him' throughout as meaning Varuṇ.

³ Probably it refers to sacrificial acts

⁴ Sayana admits the apparent inconsistency of this and II, 4, 1 where the moon is derived from the mind, but explains it away that the creation here is merely an imaginary one for

far as the quarters extend, as far as the moon extends, so far extends his world, and as long as the world of the quarters and the moon decays not, so long does his world decay not who knows thus the power of the ear. By his mind were created the waters and Varuna. The waters yield to him faith for good deeds and Varuna preserves his offspring by his law. Thus the waters and Varuna serve their parent, mind. As far as the waters extend, as far as Varuna extends, so far extends his world, and as long as the world of the waters and Varuna decays not, so long does his world decay not who knows thus the power of mind.

8 Was it water? Was it water? This world was water. This was the root, that the shoot. This the father, those the sons. Whatever there is of the son's that is the father's, whatever of the father's, that is the son's. So it is said. Mahidasa Aitareya¹ who knew this said, 'I know myself as reaching to the gods, and the gods as reaching to me'. For hence are they gifted, hence are they supported. This is the hiding-place² eye, ear, mind, speech and breath. They call it the hiding place of *brahman*. He who knows this throws down the enemy, the evil one, who hates him. The enemy, the evil one, who hates him is defeated. He is the life, the breath, being,³ and not being. The gods adored him as being, and so became great. So in sleep a man breathes *bhur bhuh*. The demons adored him as not being, and so were overthrown.⁴ He becomes great by himself who knows this. The enemy, the evil one, who

purposes of worship, a *yajñ* *vacanam* as opposed to a *yajñavantu* creation. Such inconsistencies are not very important, but this small point adds to the evidence against II, 1-3 and II, 4-6 being by one hand. For Varuna, cf Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice* pp 152 sq.

✓¹ Ahanda⁷ treats of *garusa* as the efficient cause, this Ahanda of him as the material cause. *Ap* is to be considered as an expression of the five elements according to Śāyana an unnecessary idea. The *pluti* indicates a quest on. The cause and effect are naturally identified. Ananda tirtha identifies them in *Viṣṇu*. The Garbha Upaniṣad I, traces the five elements in the human body, but the idea is not necessarily contained here.

✓² This mention is enough to prove that Mahidasa did not write the Āranyaka. But it is quite probable that he was the redactor of the Brahmana in its form of forty chapters. The saying here may no doubt be regarded as one of his Upaniṣads in the sense of secret teachings. Cf Intro, p 16. For the form, cf Leumann *Gurupitṛakāṇḍī*, p. 43.

³ Rā endralala's commentary is wrongly printed. *śeḍa* is an error for *veda* and *omaḥ* is resolved wrongly. The end of the sentence explains the dependence of duties on men for devotion.

⁴ It is called *garī*, because *prana* is swallowed up and hidden by the other senses. Cf the doctrine that the senses enter in sleep into the *prana*. The *prana* forms thus the basis of the senses. Probably the idea of the Āranyaka is something like this and the translation 'mountain' misleading. For *śloṣ* cf Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice* p 38, n 1.

⁵ Because the presence of *prana* secures the *prāṇman* (Śāyana).

⁶ Śāyana solves the difficulty of the evil effects of *ahimsa* by discriminating between the desire of *ahimsa* for oneself as shown in the ruin of the demons and for one's foe.

hates him, is overcome. He is death and immortality. A R̥si says (RV., I, 164, 38), 'Down and up he goes, grasped' by food,' for this up-breathing restrained by down-breathing does not go forth. 'The immortal dwells with the mortal,' for through him all this dwells together. For these bodies are mortal, the deity immortal. 'These two even go in different directions, they increase the one, but not the other,' for they increase the bodies, but the deity is immortal. He who knows this becomes immortal in yonder world and is seen as immortal by all beings⁴.

ADHYĀYA 2.

He who shines approached this world¹ in the shape of man. For he is the breath. So he approached it. For he who shines is the breath. For a hundred years he approached it. Therefore a hundred are the years of the life of man.

¹ Ānandātīrtha renders *madhayaṁ* by *Vīṣṇu*. 'Sāyana takes it more properly as referring to digestion. The end of the verse means, according to Sāyana, that men nourish the body by food and drink, but not the *prāṇa*. Ānandātīrtha renders, 'at death they see the bodies deserted by Vāyu.' The epithet *śakuntā* can only be justified by the fact that one of the two is immortal, and on the principle *chaitrino guchantī*. For more or less analogous cases, cf. *māsa, dhant* (Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, II, 102), and *śapāh*, RV., I, 70, 7, as interpreted by Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 70. On the same *chaitrinyaya* Govinda on Śaṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 8, 10, explains why the Drauga Śastra is the Mahāvratā according to that school is called Vāmadeva's though less than a half of it is by him (Friedländer, p. 32, n. 1). Weber (*Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 113) quotes *dvādaśau māsaṁ* from Taittiriya Saṁhitā, VII, 2, 2, 1; Kāṭhaka Saṁhitā, XXXIII, 1; Paṭicavarga Brāhmaṇa, IV, 1, 2; *śikṣan dvādaśau*, Kāṭhaka, XXXIII, 3, and similar cases from Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, IV, 5, 7, 2, XI, 6, 3, 5; XIV, 6, 9, 5; XII, 3, 2, 2; Paṭicavarga Brāhmaṇa, VI, 2, 5 (cf. *Ind. Stud.*, IX, 18). *Vīṣṇuṁ* is explained as having diverse functions, the breath moving the bodily senses, the body supporting the *prāṇendriyas*. *Vīṣṇuṁ* is referred to the fact that on death the body remains on the ground, while *prāṇa* seeks another world. Cf. Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, pp. 374 sq.; Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, II, 221; Bohlingk, *Sachs. Ber.*, 1893, p. 92; Hillebrandt, *Ved. Myth.*, I, 536, n. 1, II, 8.

² Sāyana explains 'immortal' as united with *Hiranyagarbha*; Ānandātīrtha says 'emancipated'. But that this Āraṇyaka knows emancipation, instead of immortality, as the highest end is not even probable. *Dadṛe* (II, 1, 8) and *meme* (III, 1, 1) are both clearly present passives in sense. The original sense of the perfect was not distinguished from the present in point of time but denotes a state, cf. Gilks, *Comp. Phil.*, § 549. Moore, *Homeric Grammar*, pp. 31, 32; Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.*, II, 192 sq.; *Vergl. Syntax*, II, 221 sq.; *Altindische Syntax*, p. 297; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 823. The oldest sense is quite frequent in the R̥veda. In cases like *śakṛiṣya* (I, 3, 4) and *dādhāra* (I, 5, 2) the naturally intensive form of the perfect is further strengthened.

³ This Khanda shows that the names of the acers of the R̥veda can be deduced from *prāṇa*'s actions. Ānandātīrtha explains the section as proving that Vīṣṇu is superior to all the gods. He takes *śakṛiṣyat* as 'he entered into', *brahman* and the other gods. He justifies his theory by quoting the Yāc Śukta, RV., X, 125, as proving that Yāc, i.e. *Asurī*, is superior to the gods, and she of course is inferior to Vīṣṇu.

The sun and *prāṇa* are as usual identified, the one being the *adhyātman*, the other the *adhibhūtan* representation. The former attracts the vision, the latter impels the body.

Because he approached him for one hundred years, therefore they are the Śātarcins². Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) the Śātarcins. He placed himself in the middle of all that is. Because he placed himself in the middle of all that is, therefore they are the Madhyamas. Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) the Madhyamas. As up-breathing he is the swallower, as down breathing delight. Because as up breathing he is the swallower, as down breathing delight, therefore he is Grtsamada. Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) Grtsamada. All whatsoever was his friend. Because all whatsoever was his friend, therefore he is Visvamitra. Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) Visvamitra. The gods spake to him, 'Let him be dear to all of us'. Because the gods spake to him, 'Let him be dear to all of us,' therefore he is Vamadeva. Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) Vamadeva. He protected all this from evil. Because he protected all this from evil, therefore they are the Atris. Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) the Atris.

2 He also is a bearer of offspring. Offspring is *vidya*,³ and he supports offspring. Because he supports offspring, therefore he is Bharadvāja. Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) Bharadvāja. The gods spake to him, 'Let him be the richest' of us all. Because the gods spake to him, 'Let him be the richest of us all,' therefore he is Vasiṣṭha. Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) Vasiṣṭha. He went forth⁴ to all this whatsoever. Because he went forth to all this whatsoever, therefore they are the Pragāthas. Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) the Pragāthas. He purified all this whatsoever. Because he purified all this whatsoever, then they are the Pavamānis⁵. Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) the Pavamānis. He said, 'Let me be everything small and great'. They became the Kṣudrasūktas and Mahāsūktas⁶. Therefore

² Really, Max Müller points out the name refers to their composing about 100 verses each. They are the seers of RV, 1. The Madhyamas are the seers of Books II-IV, Grtsamada of II, Visvamitra of III, Vamadeva of IV, the Atris of V. For the rest see Ahanda 2. The Madhyamas appear in *śaṣṭi* Brāhmaṇa, XII, 3. Āivalayana Gṛhya Sūtra, III 4 2, Śākhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra IV, 10, 3. Bhṛhaddevaṣ, III, 116 (Madhyamāḥ), Sarvaṇukramanī, Introd. II to 4c. For the pkr, *Atrayaḥ*, cf Oldenberg, *Z D M G*, XLII, 226, n 1.

³ *vidya* is taken as either the body from the *√yā* in the sense of going, or as food by Śiṣya.

⁴ Śiṣya translates 'causing to dwell by his entry into us', and Ānandalītha has 'best of dwellers'. The ordinary sense seems preferable. Cf II 2, 4 n 5.

⁵ This seems to be the sense and is so taken by Śiṣya. Ānandalītha takes it either as 'he obtained' or 'he sang'. Śiṣya says the verses are called *Avagīṭhā* and also the poets. Probably the poets, of Book V III, are meant. Bharadvāja and Vasiṣṭha correspond to Books VI and VII respectively. The same lists appear in Āivalayana Gṛhya Sūtra III, 4 2, and Śākhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra IV, 10 3.

⁶ Presumably the poets of Book IV are so described. Cf Āreya Brāhmaṇa (ed Burnell), p. 41, *J edicāle Studien* III, 99. In Āivalayana *paravānīs* and in Śākhāyana *paravānīs* occur.

⁷ The poets of Book V are referred to. Perhaps also the hymns were called *kṣudrasūktas* as Max Müller suggests, but this is not certain. The last *kṣudrasūktas* no doubt implies

they are the Kṣudrasūktas. 'Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) the Kṣudrasūktas. (He said), 'Ye have said what = well said.' These became a hymn⁴ Therefore there is a hymn. Therefore men call him who is (*prāṇa*) hymn. He is a verse, for he went to⁵ all beings. Because he went to all these beings, therefore he is a verse. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) = verse. He is also a half-verse, for he went to all these places.⁶ Because he went to all these places, therefore he is a half-verse. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) a half-verse. He = a quarter-verse,⁷ for he has entered all these beings. Because he has entered all these beings, he is a quarter-verse. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) a quarter-verse. He is a syllable, for he pours forth gifts to all these beings and because none can pour forth⁸ gifts beyond him. Because he pours forth gifts for all these beings, and because none can pour forth gifts beyond him, therefore he is a syllable. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) a syllable. Therefore one should know that all these verses, all these Vedas, all sounds⁹ are one word, *prāṇa*, and that *prāṇa* is all the verses.¹⁰

mahāśrūtiḥ. See besides Āivalāyana and Śāṅkhāyana, Bṛhaddevatā, III, 116, Sarvaśaṅkamanī, Intro., II, 10, with Macdonell's note.

⁴ The poet is also called Sukta, says Sāyana, but there is no authority for this.

⁵ The construction is obscure, but the rendering 'he went' seems best. The dat. is natural, cf. Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 44, Whitney, *P. A. O. S.*, April, 1891, p. clxiv, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 286 b. Ānandātīrtha renders 'he went'. Sāyana's version is *svaprasavlena pujitam akaroḥ*, taking *bhūtebhyaḥ* as *sarvabhūtartham deham*, and Max Müller renders, 'he did honour to'. He also adds that the poet is called R̥c as well as the Mantra. Cf. Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, III, 95.

⁶ *Arāṇa* is taken as 'place' (cf. *arḍh*) by both Ānandātīrtha and Sāyana, and is probably so intended, as Max Müller takes it.

⁷ Sāyana renders 'word', but this is less likely. He adds that it means also 'quarter-verse'. For the intrans. *gādi*—which (as *apādi*) is recognized by Pāṇini—cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 265, Whitney, l. c., § 845, Speyer, l. c., § 170. In Jaminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 9, 9, *avasi* seems transitive, but see Oertel's note. The use of the *nor* here is hard to distinguish from that of the imperfect, as with *akṣiprāgād* above. But in these cases it is possible that the *nor* has a sense almost present, a natural derivation from the true *norist* sense of the immediate past (cf. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*², pp. 65, 67; Giles, *Comp. Phil.*, § 552 (iv); Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 930, who points out that it is especially frequent in the Mātrīya and Saṅghīṭa). It is also possible that the imperfect sense may be old (despite Whitney, § 929 a), for it is found in the Mantra literature. In the case of *akṣiprāgād* there is the further possibility that after *āhi* it means 'he sang of all this' or 'he sang towards *āhi* this' (*akṣiprāgāya* occurs in the RV.), and in an imperfect from *√gi*, for *gi* occurs in the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa and the Mahābhārata (cf. Whitney, § 855, and *St. Petersburg Diet.*, s. v.), or even from *√gī*, go. I do not therefore think these forms are signs of late date.

⁸ 'Without him' is Max Müller's rendering. That of the text is supported by Ānandātīrtha, the other version by Sāyana. Cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 441.

⁹ Sāyana takes *śāśāḥ* as the aspirated sonants, *śā, śā, śā, śā, śā*, as in R̥gveda Prātīkhyā, 714; Siddhāntakauṇḍī (cf. Tīrthānātha), p. 14; Max Müller, *R̥gveda Prātīkhyā*, p. cclxi. It can hardly here, however, have this limited sense. Cf. Chāndogya Upaniṣad, II, 22, 3; all vowels are *śāśāḥ*.

¹⁰ Oldenberg (*Z. D. M. G.*, XLII, 199-247) has shown conclusively that few if any of the

3 Indra¹ sat down beside Viśvāmitra who was about to recite the hymns of this day. He saying, 'This is food,' recited the thousand *brhatis*. Thus he went to Indra's dear home. Indra said to him, 'Seer, thou hast come to my dear home. Do thou, seer, repeat a second² hymn.' He saying, 'This is food,' recited the thousand *brhatis* verses. Thus he went to Indra's dear home. Indra said to him, 'Seer, thou hast come to my dear home. Do thou, seer, repeat a third hymn.' He saying, 'This is food,' recited the thousand *brhatis* verses. Thus he went to Indra's dear home. Indra said to him, 'Seer, thou hast come to my dear home. I give thee a boon.' He said, 'Let me know thee.' Indra said, 'I am breath, thou, seer, art breath, all creatures are breath, he that shines is breath. In this form I pervade all the quarters. This my food is my friend, my support.' This is the food of Viśvāmitra.⁴ I am he that shines. Thus said he.⁵

4 This is produced as a thousand *brhatis*.⁶ The consonants⁷ are the body, hymns of the R̥gveda go back to their nominal composers when these composers are the heads of the great families, but that they were written by members of the family. The only possible exceptions are Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra under Sudis (p. 236). It is possible that here (p. 226 n. 1) a recollection of the facts is seen in that book V is ascribed to the Atri, while the others to individuals: Gṛtsamada, Viśvāmitra, &c., but more probably the plural is used because it gives the proper play of words with *atrayata*. This is not, however, a sign of late date, for it seems likely that in RV, 1, 181, the author held the same view as he attributes to Vasiṣṭha the *rakṣantāḥ* (VII, 31, 27, 23) and to Bharadvāja the *brhat* (VI, 46, 1, 2), later attributed to Śaṁyū Barhaspatya (Oldenberg, pp. 215, 227, n. 1).

¹ Sayana explains that this *khanda* shows the nature of the *astis* as being Indra's food. The form *upanīśatada* is wrong and can easily be corrected, but it is as old as Śākara. The Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 3, 7, has *upanīśatāda*.

² The collection of verses is regarded as three *astis* of tristuchs, in *gāyatrī*, *brhat*, and *anuk* respectively. For them, see V, 2, 3 and notes.

³ Ānandatīrtha explains *dakṣiṇam* as *dakṣiṇhoge vīṣṭa deṣaḥ pāṇaḥ jayoh aś dakṣiṇaḥ* *mitraḥ śrīraṇatāś dakṣiṇam* is *napuṃsakaprasaṅgaḥ*. Śāyana refers the use to *abhiyuddhātātātāt*, citing Dhātupāṭha, XI, 1, 7. This sense must be somewhat as in the text.

⁴ Ānandatīrtha explains *Viśvāmītram* as *Ramayāśhikamanyamēnabhrallīśaśrābhjām* *annam* *Viśvāmītrina* *sampāditat ad idam* *miṣtram* *ity ucyate*. Sayana has: *Viśvāmītrina* *īśantatāś* *īśa* *sampāditat ad idam* *Viśvāmītram*.

⁵ In Śaṅkharaya's Āranyaka, I, 6, there occurs a dialogue between Indra and Viśvāmitra. It seems to show clear signs of a later origin, though it verbally reproduces some of this dialogue. It is much more philosophical. The Jaiminiya version, I c., is very much altered, but all have clearly a common source, and use the narrative perfect (cf. Intro., p. 67). The threefold boon may be compared with the story of Niskēśas (Khāṇḍa Upaniṣad).

⁶ This *khanda* gives the correspondence of the various *astis* of the 1000 *brhatis* hymn, which is got by the addition of the verses of the whole Niskēśaśāstra, to parts of the body of *prāṇa* (Śāyana). Ānandatīrtha explains it as an identification of the various deities who preside over the seasons, &c. The number, 1000, is a number, 'hundred' (cf. V, 2, 5, XLIII, 111) counted about 37,200, and though the number could be reduced in various ways, it is not worth while.

⁷ What are called by Pāṇini *As* (Śāyana). The Nāsmāya school adopt the term *vyājanā*.

the vowels² the soul, the sibilants⁴ the breath. Knowing this he became Vasistha⁵. Thence took he the name. Indra proclaimed this to Viśvāmitra, Indra proclaimed this to Bharadvāja, so Indra is in sacrifices invoked by him as a friend⁶. This is produced as a thousand *brhatis*. Of this produced as a thousand *brhatis* there are thirty \times thousand syllables. So many thousands are the days of a hundred years. They make up the nights by the consonants, the days by the vowels⁷. This is produced as a thousand *brhatis*. After this being produced as a thousand *brhatis* he who knows this becomes full of knowledge,⁸ of the gods, of *brahman*, of the immortal, and goes to the gods. What I am⁹ he is, what he is, I am. A Rṣi says (RV I, 115, 1), 'The sun is the self of all that goes or stands'. Let one consider this.

ADHYAYA 3

He who knows himself as the fivefold hymn¹ from whence all this springs, he is wise. Earth, air, ether, water, light, these form the self, the fivefold hymn. From him all arises, into him all resolves. He who knows this is a refuge

for *kudins* as do the Sarasvatī. The term corresponds with the use of the Rgveda Pratiśakhya, see Max Müller's edit., pp. xlii sq., and with the Śranta Sūtras. *St. Petersburg Diet.*, s. v.

² Sayana takes this as in II, 2, 2, n. 12, as aspirated consonants. This can hardly be accepted. *Ātma* is taken by him as *madhyatarāram*. The vowels must somewhere be alluded to, and *ghata* can be = *svara*.

³ Ānandatīrtha and Sayana both render *śaśasā*. The Kaumara school also take this term. In the Rgveda Pratiśakhya it includes *anuvāra*, *svarga*, *jāyamañīya*, and *upadāmanya*, in the other Pratiśakhya it refers to *śatatahah*.

⁴ Sayana here ascribes the name to him causing to dwell, and his covering, cf. II, 2, 2 n. 2. Ānandatīrtha prefers 'best of dwellers'.

⁵ Sayana refers this to the Subrahmanya rite of the Soma sacrifice, where Indra is called, *Indra a gachā, harvā a gachā* (Sāyana Brahmana, I, 1, 12, Taittiriya Āraṇyaka, I, 12, 3 &c.).

⁶ The Kaumara school thus defines *śaśasā*, *Katantra* I, 1, *addhā varnasamamanyā* | *śatra catvādaśadāt svorā* (Sayana). See Max Müller, *op. cit.*, p. x.

⁷ Sayana appears to take the first part of the sentence as independent, and as describing *śrānadarā*. For *śrānā* *apya* cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 1, 2, Atareya Brāhmaṇa, IV, 24, 5. No doubt the acc. is mainly governed by the verb, but the prep. force of *apya* is too much ignored in Speyer, *Vedasche und Sanskrit-Syntax*, §§ 87.

⁸ This no doubt refers to the identity of the sun and the self, one of the oldest forms of Brahminical monism. Sayana illustrates the doctrine by a quotation from the commentary on the Brahma Sūtras, III, 3. Sun worship is a very early and widespread form of religion, cf. Farnell, *Cults of Greek States* IV, 243, Evans, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 1901, pp. 208 sq., Manucci, *Storia di Mezer* (trans. by Irvine) III, 3 for its real importance in India.

⁹ Ānandatīrtha explains that there are three *ādāt* and a *pārāśāstra* and an *uttarāhāra*. These correspond to the five forms of Vishnu, Nārāyaṇa, Vāsudeva, Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna, Aniruddha, who represent earth, ether, air, light, and water respectively.

for his friends. To him² who knows food and feeder = feeder³ is born, and food is his. Food is water and earth, for of them are foods compounded. Light and air are the feeder, for by them⁴ he eats food. Either = the bowl for in the ether is all poured. He who knows this becomes the refuge (bowl) of his friends. To him who knows food and feeder a feeder is born, and food is his. Plants and trees are food, animals the feeder, for animals eat plants and trees. Of animals, those who have teeth above and below and are formed like men,⁵ are feeders, the rest food. They overcome therefore the other animals, for the feeder is over his food. He becomes over his friends who knows this⁶.

2 He who knows more and more clearly the self obtains fuller being¹. There are plants and trees and animals, and he knows the self more and more clearly (in them). For in plants and trees sap only is seen, in animals consciousness. In animals the self becomes more and more clear, because in them sap also is seen, while thought is not seen in others². The self = more and more clear

² *Taimin* may refer to the *ātman* as Sayana and Max Müller take it. Or it may be merely a precursor of *ātman*, in accordance with the usual preference of Sanskrit for the order *sa jāt*.

³ i.e. a son able to eat. The second *āya* must, I think, refer to the father, not the son. The change of reference is too abrupt to be probable and either version = good sense. Sayana takes it as referring to the son. For the form *a jayate*, cf. Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 27, 6.

⁴ They and digestion.

⁵ Zimmer (*Altindisches Leben* pp. 74-76) shows the identity of the contrast between *ubhāyadant* and other animals, which is found in the Samhitās with the old Latin contrast of *ambidens* (in Festus not = *didens*) and *ambidors* in Aristotle. That however, *ubhāyadant* originally included the first class of sacrificial animals with man, as he holds (p. 76) appears doubtful. In this passage the resemblance to man is made explicit, and this is scarcely so likely if man were naturally one of the *ubhāyadant* class. Either *anu vidham* or the indeclinable *anuvadhau* (as in III, 2, 3) is grammatically possible, but the corruption to *anuvadhau* would be much easier than to *anu vidham*. *Anuvadhau* is also possible. *ī adhi* occurs several times *infra* II, 3, 4, 5. Cf. *vidham anuvadhate*, Maitrāyaṇi Samhitā, III, 2, 4, 10.

⁶ In *adhiṣṭa caranti* the acc. is governed by *adhi*, a use found in Mantra and Brāhmaṇa alike (Speyer, *Indische und Sanskrit Syntax*, II, 87, 88, Atharvaveda XIV, 49, 2 *adhi vishṇu aruḥ gābhira* RV, VIII, 68, 15^b *adhi tishṭhan satvam vatham*, Vajrasaneyi Samhitā, VI, 1 *adhi tva śikāyate* &c.) I do not, however, think it can well be construed with the gen., so I think the gen. *śamanandam* is a partitive one 'of his friends he, &c.' For similar cases of the partitive gen., cf. I, 2, 3 n. 6 and Harvaṇṇa, II, 79, 12, where Hopkins / A O S, XXII, 152, n. 1, takes the gen. as local. Delbrück (*Altindische Syntax*, p. 441) is, I think, wrong in holding that *adhi* rarely has the accusative. The root *sthā*, e.g., would not naturally take an acc. without the aid of a preposition. Cf. II, 2, 4 n. 8.

¹ This is the most philosophical part of the whole Āranyaka and is a determined effort to explain the diverse stages of conscious life. It will be observed that the distinctive marks of man are all elements which make his consciousness into an ordered system and they imply self-consciousness, as opposed to the mere consciousness of animals in the form of their receptivity of external stimuli. The theory of the soul in Aristotle *De Anima*, II, 4, 19, is worth comparing. For the form *astatman* cf. I, 4, 1, n. 21, Bohtlingk, *Sachs Ber.*, 1893, p. 11.

² Max Müller renders, 'but in others thought is not seen,' the apparent meaning being that

in man. For he is most endowed with intelligence, he says what he has known, he sees what he has known, he knows to-morrow, he knows the world and what is not the world. By the mortal he desires the immortal, being thus endowed. As for the others, animals, hunger and thirst comprise their power of knowledge. They say not what they have known, they see not what they have known. They know not to-morrow, they know not the world and what is not the world. They go as far, for their experiences are according to the measure of their intelligence.³

3 This man is the sea,⁴ he is above all the world. Whatever he reaches, he desires to be beyond it.⁵ If he gains the sky world, he desires to be beyond it. If he were to gain yonder world, he would desire to be beyond it. Fivefold is this man.⁶ What is hot in him is fire; the apertures are the ether, blood, mucus, and seed are water, the body is earth, the breath is air. Fivefold is the air;⁴ up-breathing, down breathing, back-breathing, out-breathing, on-breathing

some animated beings have not thought. What must be meant is that others, i.e. plants and trees, have no intelligence, and as Sayana and Ānandaturtha construe *ṁ* *ḥara* frequently means, like *śālo* and *ahur*, others, not as opposed to a part of a species, but as another species, *A J P*, VII, 101. Stones have only *sattā*, says Sayana, i.e. are only objective, not also subjective.

³ Sayana takes the last sentence as meaning they are born according to their knowledge in a former birth. This, however, assumes the transmigration theory, which is not certainly known in this Aranyaka. The better meaning seems to be that taken above, which is more suited in point of fact to the context for the idea of former birth is nowise necessary or in point. Sayana cites *Bṛhadaranyaka Upaniṣad*, IV, 4, 2 and 7, but this *Upaniṣad* is earlier. The word *yathāgrāham* does not occur in Jacob's *Concordance*. Kannīaki *Upaniṣad*, I, 2, has *yathāgrāham* of transmigration. See also Lévi *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, pp. 96 sq.

⁴ The sea is typical of all unsatisfied desires. Sayana cites *Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa*, II, 2, 6 *hamam jansidraṁ atreṇetye āha | sampidra ita hi hamah | masta hi hamatyanto 'ste na samu dravya |* The same idea appears over and again in the Greek Anthology, cf. *Bocher, Greek Genius*, pp. 166 sq. For the separation of the prefix and verb, cf. *Introd.*, p. 37, and examples from the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* in *Liebeck, Panini*, p. 24, and from *Bṛhadaranyaka*, p. 28.

⁵ *Enam* in R and in Sayana must stand for *m* in place of an assimilated *n*, as in II, 1, 5 n 6. For *at* *aman*, cf. *Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa*, I, 42 (*J A O S*, XV, 234).

⁶ Cf. II, 3, 1, n 1. Ānandaturtha here repeats the identifications with the different forms of *Vāna*.

⁷ The five *prāṇas* frequently occur. No intelligible explanation of them is possible. *Prāṇa* and *apāṇa*, once originally the same, were first divided as expiration and inspiration, then as breath, and the wind of digestion, cf. II, 4, 1 and 2. *Uyāna* 'through breathing or circulating air' (Egeling *S B E*, XLIII, 163, n 1) is the bond between the *prāṇa* and *apāṇa*. *Samāna*, which 'introduces the ingested quies through the united' (Egeling, p. 164, n 1), leads to union of the two first. *Udāna* conducts the soul from the body at death. See Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 249-252, E. T., pp. 276-280, and I, 2, 7, n 6. Sayana says that *prāṇa* is in the mouth and nose, rising from the heart, *apāṇa* is in the lower parts, *vyāṇa* in all the veins, *māna* in the throat to lead forth the soul, *samāna* leads food and drink evenly through the whole body. *Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa*, II, 5, 6 adds *śvāna* to the number. For further variations see *sa* 1, 3, 7, 4, 1. The same five as here occur in *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* 2, 1, 4, 2-6, and *Maitriya Upaniṣad*, II, 6, where see Cowell's

The duties, sight, hearing, mind, and speech, are comprised in up-breathing and down breathing. For they depart with the departure of breath. He is the succession¹ of speech and thought which is the sacrifice. The sacrifice is fivefold, Agnihotra, new and full moon sacrifices, the four monthly sacrifices, the animal sacrifice, and the Soma sacrifice. The Soma-sacrifice is the most perfect of the sacrifices, for these five kinds are seen in it, that which precedes the libations,² is one, then there are three libations, and the rest (of the sacrifice) is the fifth.

4 He³ who knows one sacrifice above the other, one day above the other, one god above the gods, is clever. This great litany is the sacrifice above the other, the day above the other, the god above the others. This litany is fivefold. As a chorus⁴ it is *trivṛt*, *pañcadāśa*, *saptadāśa*, *ekaviṃśa*, and

notes, and Max Müller, *S B E*, XV, 293. With the following, cf. Bhādaranyaka Upaniṣad (Kauṣa), I, 4, 17, where man, animal, sacrifice, and *sartam idam* are all fivefold, and Taittiriya Upaniṣad, I, 7, 1, where mind, speech, breath, sight, and hearing are man.

¹ For *ustarottar*, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* II, 1, 60. For *aps* + $\frac{1}{4}$, cf. Caland *Altind. Zeitschrift*, p. 18.

² That is the *dāśa*. The last is the *avasthika udavasaniya*, see Hillebrandt, *Kritische Literatur*, pp. 97 sq. It is worth noting that the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa does not deal with the new and full moon or the four monthly sacrifices, though the Kaṇva does, cf. *Introd.*, p. 32.

³ This section is unusually foolish. Ānandabhr̥ta exercises much ingenuity in equating the five forms of Viṣṇu to the several members of each of the sets of five. The parts of the *śaman* are also dealt with in Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, IV, 9, 10. See Hillebrandt, *Kritische Literatur*, p. 100.

⁴ Sayana explains these as follows: *trivṛt śama* is formed by the three hymns at the beginning of the Samaveda Utiṣaraka, 1, 9, RV, IX, 11, 1-3, 64, 18, 30, 65, 20-12. The first three verses are taken from the first verse of each *śukla*, the second from the second verses, and the third from the third. It is called *udya*. The *pañcadāśa* is formed out of one hymn, by repeating the first verse three times, the second and third once each, then repeating the second three times, and so on. The *saptadāśa* is the *pañcadāśa* save that in the third round the second and third verses each are repeated thrice, i.e. (1) aaabc, (2) abbbc, (3) abbbccc. The *ekaviṃśa* is made by singing all verses three times, except the last first and second respectively in the three rounds, i.e. (1) aaabbbc, (2) abbbccc (or aaabccc—the MSS vary), (3) aaabccc (or abbbccc). The *pañcaviṃśa* is formed by singing in the first round the first verse thrice, the second four times, the third once, in the second round, the first once, the second thrice, the third four times, in the third round, the first five times, the second once, the third three times, according to Dharmapāya, or the first four times, the second twice, the third thrice, according to Gāṇṭhī. (This seems to be the sense, R's version is corrupt and S is imperfect.) These *śaman*s are called *pañcaviṃśakam* (not as Max Müller, *vidyā*, which is the generic title of which these are species), *śaśasaptā*, and *saptaviṃśakam*, no name for the last being given. Max Müller quotes Mahidhara on *Yajurveda Saṃhitā* X, 9 for the *trivṛt*. More in point is Sayana on Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 42 which closely resembles this passage. The *St Petersburg Dict.* (s.v. *trivṛt*) gives the *trivṛt* as consisting of one *śukla*, RV, IX, 11 only, see Eggeling *S B E*, XXVI, 308, 309, *Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa*, I, 11 sq., II, 1, 1, 7, 1, 14, 1, Hillebrandt *l.c.*, p. 102, and schemes in Caland and Henry's *L'Agnistoma*.

pañcalimsa As a *sāman*¹ it is *gayatra*, *rathantara*, *brhat*, *bhadra*, and *rājana*. As to metre it is *gayatri*, *usuh*, *brhati*, *tristubh*, and *dupadā*. The explanation² is that it is the head, the right wing, the left wing, the tail, and the body (of the bird). He performs³ the *prastava* five times, the *udgītha* five times, the *prathihāra* five times, the *upadrava* five times, the *udhāna* five times. This forms a thousand syllables⁴. The verses here are recited = five orders⁵. What precedes the eighty tristichs is one order; then come the three sets of eighty tristichs, and the fifth consists of the rest. Thus makes a thousand (verses)⁶. That = the whole, these ten by tens are the whole. For number is such. Ten tens are a hundred, ten hundreds a thousand, and that = the whole. These are the three metres, this food indeed is threefold, eating, drinking, and chewing. He obtains this food by these.

5 This = produced as a thousand *brhatīs*. Some recognize a thousand of various metres, saying, 'Is there another?' let us say there is'. Some say a thousand *tristubhs*, some a thousand *gayatīs*, some a thousand *anustubhs*. A Rsi says (RV, X, 124, 9), 'Sages in their wisdom discovered Indra dancing an *anustubh*'⁷. That denotes, they discovered in speech then the breath of Indra. He can become famous and of splendid renown. 'Rather' he is liable to die untimely,⁸

¹ The *gayatra sāman* is formed from RV, III, 62, 10, *rathantara* from RV, VII, 31, 22, the *brhat* from RV, VI 46, 1, the *bhadra* from RV, X, 157, 1, the *rājana* from RV, VII, 27, 1, according to Sayana's note, cf V, 7, 2, n 2.

² See Āranyaka, I, 4, 2.

³ The *sāman* of the Niskeralya is the *rājana*, and each of its usual five parts is repeated five times. The *upadrava* falls to the Udgāt and all join in the *udhāna* (Sāyana).

⁴ The *stobhas* are meaningless syllables, added = verses sung to make up the metre. See Chandogya Upansad, I, 12. These syllables are marked = Samaveda MSS, but they have not as yet been satisfactorily explained. Cf Burnell, *Samhitapāṇasud Brahmana*, p xviii, Hillebrandt, I a, p 104, n 15, Caland and Henry, op cit, App II.

⁵ The verses corresponding to the body, head, wings, &c, are the first order, the three *afitis* follow, then come the belly and chest verses.

⁶ There are 1000 *stobhas* and also in the whole Śāstra a 1000 *brhatas*. The rest refers to the nature of number as being measured by tens. There are nothing but sets of ten. The three 'metres' mean, according to Sayana, the numbers 10, 100, 1000 which govern all numbers. This however is inadequate, as the reference is clearly to the three sets of *afitis*. The reference to food = because these *afitis* are the food of the bird. There is no sign that the numbers 100 or 1000 are to be treated = specially important. Sayana's explanation is otherwise good. He quotes for *dalatīh*, Panini, V, 1, 60. Anandathītha is very weak on this point.

⁷ Sāyana takes *kim anyat* as the question, and the answer. The others do not include the Śākhayanas, who also recognize a thousand *brhatas*. This is rather in favour of an early date, the dispute had disappeared before the Śākhayana Āranyaka. *Anant* may be adverbial, 'variously'.

⁸ Sayana explains that the clouds rumbling produce a sound with an *anustubh* in it, cf Geldner, *Indische Studien*, II, 304, v Schroeder, *Mysterium und Mimus*, pp 40, 41.

⁹ Anandathītha takes the whole as one argument and as meaning, 'he can die when he likes.' This is impossible. For the construction, cf I, 1, 1, n 4.

he⁴ declares. For the self that in speech is imperfect, since⁵ a man understands if driven to thought by breath, not if driven by speech. Let him produce the *brhati*,⁶ for the *brhati* is the whole self. The self is on all sides surrounded by members, and, as the self is on all sides surrounded by members,⁷ so is the *brhati* on all sides surrounded by metres. The self is the middle of the members, and the *brhati* of metres.⁸ He can become famous and of splendid renown, while the other⁹ will die untimely, so said he. For the *brhati* is the whole self. Therefore let him produce the *brhati*.

■ This is produced as a thousand *brhatīs*. Of this produced as a thousand *brhatīs*, there are eleven hundred and twenty-five *anustubh*.¹ For by the larger the smaller is comprehended. A R¹ says (RV, VIII, 76, 13), 'I a speech of eight feet,' for there are eight feet of four syllables. 'Of nine corners,' for the *brhati*.²

¹ Anandātirtha points out that 'he' is Aitareya Mahadasa or Mahatāreya. Sayana vaguely says 'a wise man'. Cf. I, 1, 1, n. 3.

² This is very obscure. The version here adopted means that the activity of *manas* if evoked by speech (= *anustubh*) only is imperfect, but it is more perfect if evoked by breath (= *brhati*). *Manas* will then stand in its wider sense, not as an *indriya*, as later, cf. Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, p. 245, E. T., p. 271. This is very strained, but at least it is less absurd than (1) Sayana's version, 'If he proceeds with the Śāstra with reference to the *anustubh* which is proclaimed as *vac*, and not with reference to the *brhati* which is proclaimed as *prana*, then being driven by his mind he does not manage the Śāstra by speech alone'. He adds that without breath speech merely conceived is inadequate, breath being essential for any sense activity. The idea is not unlike the one adopted above. (2) Anandātirtha renders, 'Being urged to objects of sense by *prana*, i.e. *vāya*, and by *manas*, i.e. *śiva*, he enjoys them, and not by voice alone'. He read *manas* because he tries to account for the *e*. Sayana must have read *prana na* and taken *vac* as an accusative or locative, as Max Müller points out. For the *dat*, which is rarely found in the local sense in the Bṛāhmaṇa style (Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 144), see Speyer, *Indische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 43, and cf. II, 2, 2, n. 7.

³ I e. make out that the *brhati* is the metre.

⁴ Because it is surrounded in the Śāstra (Sayana).

⁵ Because metres are both bigger and smaller than the *brhati*.

⁶ Sayana ignores the difficulty of this passage. Anandātirtha of course renders it, 'he is able to die at will'. The text follows Max Müller's version. The syntax *pad brhati* is very common in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 43, &c., Śaṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 4 &c.; *Altindische Syntax*, p. 564.

⁷ 1000 × 36 syllables (*brhatīs*) = 1125 × 32 syllables (*anustubh*).

⁸ I e. It is nine feet of four syllables and is formed by adding one to the eight feet of the *anustubh*. Sayana says the MS. *manasuktā* is *chindasā*. Cf. Denisy, *Samaveda, Glossary*, p. 87. The correction *manasuktā*, though easy, is more convincing, because of *r* following Cf. Wachernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 32, Macdonell, *Sadā Grammar*, p. 63, n. 15. MSS frequently differ in such points, cf. Whitney's note on AV, VI, 33, 2 (*vyathī*), cf. V, 1, 1, n. 18, 2, 1, n. 6. Note should be taken here of the readings of the Mānava Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 2, 6 *śatruṃśat* is the acc., and I, 23, 15 and 23 *śat śatruṃśat* *anustubh* combined with Mānava Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 2, 6 *śat śatruṃśat* *ayam te* (see Haug, p. 211). I confess that the possible explanation suggested by Dr. Haug of these cases as either contractions with omission of *anustubh* or *śatru* or as neutrals is not attractive. In the last case, as perhaps here, the original may have been as Dr. Haug also suggests *śatruṃśat* (I) *ayam te*, &c., with the loss

becomes nine-cornered 'Touching the truth,' for speech* united with verse
 ■ truth 'I made' the body out of Indra,' for from this thousand *brāhmi*
 made into *anustubh*, which is *prana* connected with Indra, and from the
brāhmi he makes speech, the *anustubh*, as a body. The great liany is the
 highest development of speech, and it ■ fivefold, measured, unmeasured, music,
 true, and untrue. A *re* verse, a *gāthā*,* a *kumbhā*,* are measured, a *yajus* verse,
 an invocation, conversation,* are not measured, a *saman* or part of it ■ music;
 om ■ true, no is untrue. The flower and fruit of speech is what is true. He
 can become famous and of splendid renown, for he speaks the truth, the flower
 and fruit of speech. The untrue is the root of speech, and, as a tree with
 roots exposed dries up, and perishes, so a man who speaks untruth exposes
 his roots, dries up, and perishes. Therefore let a man speak not untruth, but
 guard himself against it. The syllable* om is empty and goes forward. So if

of *ō* (as often in MSS in *pausa*) and subsequent erroneous contraction. So *pañcasiṃhāt*(*ṃ*)
 may have been written by error in the MS and then the *ṃ* dropped and contraction applied.
 But in verse, of course, we find clear cases of contraction or of the use of shortened forms, especially
 so for *eva*, e.g. Śaṅkhayana Aranyaka, XII, 29 *putram eva must matra causa be putreva* or
putraya *ca*, probably the former, Oldenberg, *Z D A G*, LXI, 830, Roth, *ibid*, XLVIII, 68.

* Speech is *anustubh*, verse *brāhmi*, and united they touch *prana*. Ānandavīrha explains by
 equating *brāhmi* with a form of *Viṣṇu* and speech with *Udāt*.

* 'He makes' in Max Müller's translation, ignores *aham*. Śāyana does not do this,
 but ■ explains the sentence by the action of the *Itot*, as the Aranyaka uses the third person.
 It only means that the *anustubh* is made out of the *brāhmi* which is identified with *prana*,
 and *prana* ■ (see II, 2, 3) Indra.

* Śāyana defines a *gāthā* as *śarvalokaprasiddharthapratipadikā*, e.g. *prajāḥ prolar anṛitam*
te vadanti (a *yajñagāthā* from *Atareya Brāhmaṇa*, V, 31, 6, the example is not very happy).
 Ānandavīrha as *parāparāṃ āmanāṃ cāmanāmbhāyakaṃ caaranyamarākṣiṇi* *Ānanda-*
śākyam. Cf Hopkins, *Great Epic of India*, pp. 365 sq. *St Petersburg Diet*, II, 737, Aufrecht,
Atareya Brāhmaṇa, p. 429, Bloomfield, *Religion of Veda*, p. 196.

* Śāyana defines as *śāntakṣiṇya*, e.g. *brāhmacāry aya apo 'ana kama kuru divi ma*
svapnā or *ma svapnāḥ* (the MSS vary), i.e. *Āśvalayana Gṛhya Sūtra*, I, 21, 2, Ānandavīrha as
yajñagāthāyām. In the parallel passage, *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*, XI, 5, 7, 10 (where see
 Eggeling's trans. *S B E*, XLIV, 101) *kumayā* is real, which Weber (*Ind. Stud*, 2,
 111, n. 1) suggests as equal to 'refrain', cf *kumbha kura*.

* Śāyana explains *brāhmaṇagatya ye 'rthavada* *ya ca rajasādhadām parihāsa śrāpēnoyāḥ* *id*
śarva vṛthā vāt, Ānandavīrha simply has *nyarthakāḥ*. Cf *Vedische Studien* I, 118, 318. For
ugada see *St Petersburg Diet*, s.v., Bhadddevata, VIII, 104, Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch*
Litt, I, 142, n, who describes them as a kind of Yajus to summon the other priests to perform
 their tasks. Śāyana gives as an example: *uk a yajña Agne mahāḥ aya brāhmaṇa dhārata*
 (=Taittiriya Saṃhitā, II 5, 9 1, Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 266). For *saman*, cf.
 Winternitz, p. 146, n. 3, who renders it as originally 'Besamfigungsbild', 'ein Mittel zur Be-
 schwichtigung von Göttern und Dämonen', Bloomfield, *Religion of Veda*, p. 38.

* A curious piece of common sense (cf Mr Falconer's advice to Pepsy, *Diary*, Aug 8,
 1862) interpolated to avoid the danger of the preceding doctrine that *om* is truth. For *om*
 as *tatva*, see *Atareya Brāhmaṇa*, VII, 18, and *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, I, 1, 8. The comparison
 with *amṛta* is of course accidental, Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt*, I, 162, n. 1.

a man says *om*, then that⁸ is taken from him, if he should say *om* to everything, he would empty himself and be unable to have delights. The syllable 'no' is full⁹ for one's self. If a man should say 'no' to everything, his fame would be evil and he would destroy himself. Therefore should one give in the proper time, and at the proper time he should refrain¹⁰ from giving. So does he unite the true and the untrue. From their union he grows and becomes greater. He who knows this speech of which (the great many) is a modification, he is clever. 'A' is the whole of speech and being manifested¹¹ through the mutes and sibilants it becomes manifold and various. If uttered in a whisper it is breath, if aloud it is body. Therefore it is as it were hidden, for what is incorporeal is as it were hidden, and breath is incorporeal. But spoken aloud it is body and visible, for body is visible.

7 This is produced as a thousand *brhatis*. It is glory,¹² it is Indra, it is the lord of creatures. 'He who knows it as Indra, as the lord of creatures, leaves this world shaking¹³ off all ties,' so said Mahidasa¹⁴ Āitareya. Having departed, having become Indra,¹⁵ he shines in those worlds. They say, 'If by this form he gains yonder world, then by what form does he experience this world?'

⁸ Sayana construes as 'he is emptied for that, viz. the enjoyment of house, fields, &c.' This is to force the meaning of *atmas* overmuch, it is a *dativus accommodi*.

⁹ Is selfish. Sayana cites Bhagavadgītā, II, 34 *sambhavadāya takirīr maraṇad atirasya* |

¹⁰ Rajendralāla prints in text and commentary *kalena*. It should be *kāle na* as the commentary and also Anandātīrtha, shows.

¹¹ 'A' with the different letters is the source of the alphabet. It may be interesting to speculate if this denotes that writing where the 'a' was not expressed was already known. It may be so, but it is not clear. In any case as the date of writing is very doubtful, no great light would be thrown on the date of the Āranyaka, cf V 3, 3 || 6a, where the reference is clear but cogent only for Śaunaka's period. For later reference to the *aldra* see Jacob, *Concordance*, p. 2 and cf Tandyā Mahābrahmana, 22, 14.

¹² Sayana compares Taittirīya Āranyaka I 1 *na tasya kale kalena tasya nama mahad yatah* | For Indra, cf II, 4, 3. Taittirīya Upaniṣad, I, 4, Kaṇṇakī Upaniṣad, II 6, III 1. Bṛhad āranyaka Upaniṣad, III 2.

¹³ This is the sense rather than, 'Indra is the lord as taken by Max Müller. Elsewhere below is the usual Sanskrit attraction of a pronoun to the gender of the predicate, *fergl Syntax*, III, 240 sq.

¹⁴ This must be the sense, and so both Sayana and Anandātīrtha take it. Originally the word meant the decay of old age.

¹⁵ The quotation ends here, it seems. The new sentence looks like a prose version of a Śloka cf V, 3.

¹⁶ Sayana quotes Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, IV 1 2 *devo bhūtvā devan ajyeta* | He refers also to Brahma Sūtra, IV, 3 15, and discusses whether this deification is a hindrance to real *mukti* and decides it is really a step towards it. But of course the doctrine of *mukti* is not clearly found in this Āranyaka, see II, 1 2 || 9, Hopk. as *Religions of India* pp 232, 238 sq.

¹⁷ For the nasal || *phuts*, cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 299, 300, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 78.

The blood in the woman¹ is the form of Agni, therefore one should despise it not. The seed in the man is the form of Āditya, therefore one should despise it not. This self gives itself to that self, that self gives itself to this self². They thus gain each other. In this form³ he gains yonder world, in that form he experiences this world.

8 Here there are these verses⁴—

¹ Ānandatītha has a wonderful explanation: This world and that world are both *svastirāpaṃ* of Bhagavat. Sayana explains that there are six elements in the body, three, fat, bone, and marrow, are white and represent the man, three, skin, blood, and flesh, are red and represent the woman. *agnis* = used of the woman because she is connected with earth, *āditi* of the man because he is connected with the sun and the upper world.

² The fact that Sayana does not comment on *śraddhā* shows how little he can be relied on to note points in the text. The reading is quite certain, and of Whitney, I c, § 503 b.

³ This is taken by Sayana and by Max Müller as referring to the words at once preceding. But it is perhaps rather a reference to the question above. Then *anya* will refer to the knowledge of Indra, and *anyā* to the human form produced by the union of the parents. Sayana seems to have been misled by the use of Agni and Āditya into misinterpreting *loham*. The tone of the section is noteworthy when contrasted with the pessimism which the body and its imperfections induces in Buddhism and the later Upaniṣads (Maitrayana Upaniṣad, I, 2-4, Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Lit.*, I, 324). Max Müller's view (*S. B. E.*, XV, 1-1n) that, despite its references to Nirvana (p. xlvii) and other hints at Buddhism (e.g. VII, 8), this Upaniṣad is anti-Buddhist cannot be supported. The irregular *śāṇḍilya* is merely a conscious and deliberate richness (or perhaps also in the Manava Grhya Sūtra, a piece of patchwork), and generally the language is quite recent = form compared to the really old Upaniṣads. Deussen recognizes the later character and style of the Upaniṣad and Winternitz (p. 225) definitely refers it to a post-Buddhist date. Indeed Weber (*Indian Literature* pp. 96 sq.) and Macdonell (*Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 230, 231) tend to refer it to classical times though its doctrine is no doubt earlier. The optimism of the Upaniṣad is natural: what is other than the *ātman* is miserable, but not the *ātman*, cf. Bhāṣya on Upaniṣad, III, 5, Taittiriya Upaniṣad, II, 9, III, 6, Ita Upaniṣad, 7, Hopkins, *Religions of India* p. 240.

⁴ The verses are probably older than the prose. They are earlier than the *śraddhā* cited by Patanjali (cf. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 483 sq.) and show every sign of antiquity in their metrical form (cf. *J. R. A. S.*, 1906 pp. 2-10, Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XXV, xxxv, Hopkins, *Great Epics of India*, pp. 194 sq.) which is decidedly irregular. The third verses of 1, 2, 4 are *jagats*, the first verse of 1 has only ten syllables, the last verse of 4 only 9 and even if by resolutions they are altered into 11 syllable verses, then the characteristic *śraddhā* ending is missing. In no case are the four verses assimilated, and indeed in no case are even two verses assimilated. The last stanza, *śāṇḍilya* 1, is in iambic ended *anustubh*, a very early verse indeed. It is of course true, as Bloomfield (*Aitareya-śāṇḍilya*, p. 41, 42) points out that the actual development of the *anustubh* (*śāṇḍilya* 1 and 3) cannot possibly have been from $\times \times \times \times \times \times \times \times \times \times$ to $\times - \times - \times - \times - \times - \times$, and thence to the Epic Śloka with its differentiated *śāṇḍilya*, but that the iambic *anustubh* is a priestly as opposed to a popular verse with free *śāṇḍilya* 1 and 3. But it is equally clear that the development of the iambic *anustubh* in the priestly circles was comparatively early and that the later verse writers tended more and more to fall back (with sporadic cases of imitation such as in the Viṃśāda hymns, see my criticism* of Arnold's *Vedic Metre*, in *J. R. A. S.*, 1906,

* I may note here a small point confirmatory of my criticism of Prof. Arnold's views. The term *śāṇḍilya* (*śāṇḍilya*) occurs in RV, X, 61, 8 which is therefore naturally called one of the

Of speech that which is 'yes' and which is 'no',
That which is harsh⁶ and that which is immense,
Laying aside⁷ have poets found their quest,
They, bound by names,⁸ rejoiced in the revealed || 3 ||

In which⁹ revealed the poets did rejoice,
In it in unity the gods exist,
'Casting aside all evil by this lore,'¹⁰
The wise one rises to the world of heaven || 4 ||

Neither by name of woman¹¹ is he called,
Nor yet by name of neither man nor woman,
Nor yet by name of man may he be named
By him who fain would tell the name of breath || 5 ||

Brahman is called 'a' and the 'I' is there contained¹² This is produced as a thousand *brhasis*. Of this produced as a thousand *brhasis* there are thirty-six thousand syllables. So many are the thousands of the days of man's life. By the syllable of life¹³ alone does he obtain the day of life, and by the day of life the syllable of life. There is a chariot of the gods which destroys desires¹⁴. Its seat

⁶ Sayana cites Taittiriya Āranyaka, IV, 27 (Ānandaśrama ed., p. 333) *āhat pāṇaḥ yahi chandāḥ bhindāḥ bandhāḥ kṛd ita vacaḥ kṛurāḥ*; ulkashtrius he renders *akrośādikam*. Cf. also Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra, XIV, 24, 2, Hillebrandt, *Ritual Literature*, p. 266, 1 ed. *Myth*, III, 366.

⁷ *tejasya* like *nama* in ver. 4 appears 'metrical'.

⁸ This merely means they rose above mere names to the unity of *brahman* or *prana*. Sayana renders 'dependent on the letter 'a' which is the name of *prana*'. Anandatirtha refers to the names of Bhṛgusvant.

⁹ *nama* is rendered by Sayana as equivalent to *namayastāḥ* above. This cannot be the case, nor can it well be for *namas* as Ānandatirtha construes it. It must be for *noma* the last *a* being lengthened *metre causa*. For such cases cf. Macdonell *Indian Grammar* p. 62, Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* || 437. Sāṅkhyaśāstra Sūtra XVII 9 7, XVIII, 22 10, even in prose (cf. *Intro.*, p. 70) *J A O S*, XLV, 98, below, III, 1, 2, 2.

¹⁰ By the help of *brahman* is Sayana's version and so also Anandatirtha takes it. More probably it is by aid of this doctrine. For *apahatyā*, cf. Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, II, 1 10, 2.

¹¹ Sayana quotes Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, V, 10 (the late metre is noteworthy) —

*naita stri na jman ita naura sayam napumśakah |
yamāc charāram dāṭte tena tena sa aryaṇe ||*

For the nominative, cf. passages like Bhṛgudevatā, V, 39 where I would read *Īśāpatih* with MSS. h d, Rgveda Prāśasthya, VIII, 26, Taittiriya Saṃhitā V 7, 4, 4, &c.

¹² This must be taken as a clear assertion that *brahman* includes the individual self. Sayana says it refers to Hiranyagarbha quoting the very late Vāṇspottaratipaniṣya Upaniṣad, V *śarvāhamāṇas Hiranyagarbhāḥ* |

¹³ Ānandatirtha explains the *adāra* as the female form of *Varuṇ*, the *adāra* (we) as the male. As a matter of fact the sentence merely asserts he obtains *brahman* or *prana* by means of *brahman* or *prana* as both are revealed in the syllable and the ritual of the Mahāvratā day, as in I, 2, 2.

¹⁴ Sayana explains this as a chariot of Hiranyagarbha. Anandatirtha renders *anaktima*

in speech, its two sides the ears, the horses the eyes, the driver the mind. Breath mounts upon it. A Rṣi says (RV, X, 39, 12), 'Come hither on what is quicker than mind,' and (RV, VIII, 73, 2), 'On what is quicker than the winking of an eye'."

ADHYĀYA 4.

In the beginning¹ the one self was this, there was nothing else blinking. He² thought, 'Shall I create worlds?' He created these worlds, water, light,

mdrah as, '*Prāna* has no desires and delights in *Mayā*' i.e. Rāmā. Really all that is meant is that there is a chariot, viz. the body, where *prāna* mounts as contained above in the verses. Anandaśrīha explains the *udāh* as *Patā* in snake form *śrotra* as *Candra* and his wife, *śakti* as *Candra* and his wife, *cat* = *i* as *Surya* and his wife, *manah* as *Rudra*. The metaphor is not rare, e.g. 3, quotation in *Āvalāyana Śānta Sūtra* VI, 5, 3, *Śākhāyana Āranyaka*, I, 8, RV, III, 14, 7, as interpreted by Leisgauer (Oldenberg, *S B E*, XLVI, 170) where the prayer is a chariot, *Atharvaveda* VIII, 8, 22, where *udāh* and *śakti* also occur, and are rendered as above by Whitney, *Matrīyaṇi Sarpāṇā*, III, 4, 4, *Kāṣhaka Samhitā*, VII, 8.

¹ Śrīyana adds a long digression (cf. Max Müller, *S B E*, I, 235, 236) on the difference of this *pranavādyā* from that of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* and the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, in which *prāna* is not related to the *Mahāvratā* ceremony. Following as usual Śākhara he also discusses what is the result of this *pranavādyā*, and concludes that it leads after death and absorption in the *paramātman* to rebirth as the *brahmaleka* where after enjoyment of all the powers of a deity, he proceeds to obtain full knowledge and *mukti*. But Śākhara ignores the fact that *mukti* is not as yet known to this *Āranyaka*, which in its philosophic doctrine reaches only the unity of existence and the identity of the self and *brahman* and which promises immortality, not liberation, to the devout. It is impossible even to say that this *Āranyaka*, II, 1-3 realises clearly the doctrine that *ātman* is consciousness, though it approaches this standpoint. It does not assert that the self is unknowable as pure subject or the unreality of existence, as is done by the later Upaniṣads and the Vedānta. To the writer of this Upaniṣad immortality meant a continuance of conscious existence, because the identity of the self and the world did not involve in any way the destruction of self. All that it involved was the destruction of what is really self from its accidents. It is of course true that this position is not strictly consistent, but it is no more unsatisfactory than that of Vedāntism.

² Śākhara, Anandaśrīha, and Sayana all expend great efforts in explaining this short Upaniṣad, II, 4-6, but they mainly deal with difficulties which do not arise if no effort is made to reconcile this text with pure Vedāntism or to explain logically its inconsistencies. The real advance on II, 1-3, consists in (1) the fact that *ātman* is the subject, not as before *prāna*, *puṣṭi*, (2) that *ātman* and *brahman* are more explicitly recognized as intelligence, but both these points are foreshadowed in II, 1-3. Max Müller (*S B E*, I, 236) leans to the view that this Upaniṣad rises from the conception of life to that of the self, but this is rather too great a distinction. This Upaniṣad is a little more advanced than II, 1-3 but not much so. Deussen (*Sekṣya Upaniṣad*), of course, interprets it as a later Upaniṣad and reads into it doctrines not contained in it. Colebrooke (*Essays*, I, 47-53), Roer (*Trans*, pp. 26-34), and S. Sitarāma (*Upaniṣad* V, 1-64) follow Śākhara. On *udāh*, cf. Max Müller, *S B E*, XI, xix. Bohlingk has rendered the Upaniṣad, *Sekṣya Bṛ*, 1890 p. 161, cf. 1891, p. 85, 1897, p. 9. For Rāmānuja's interpretation, cf. *S B E*, XLVIII, 71, 81, 201, 205, 391, 417, 451, &c. ³ This is an imitation of the *Puruṣa Sūkta* RV, X, 90, cf. Taittiriya *Āranyaka* III, 12, but, as Deussen points out with the essential difference that the metaphysical *prātis* of the *prurūpa* is the *ātman*. The view of the relation of the *ātman* to the world is cosmogonic,

mortal, and waters. This water is above the³ heaven, and heaven supports it. The lights are the sky. The mortal is the earth, those under the earth are the waters. He thought, 'There are these worlds. Shall I create guardians of the world?' He formed the person,⁴ taking him out from the waters.⁵ He brooded⁶ on him, and when he was brooded over, a mouth burst forth as an egg does. From the mouth came speech, from speech fire. Nostrils burst forth. From the nostrils came forth scent,⁷ from scent wind. Eyes burst forth. From the eyes came forth sight, from sight the sun. Ears burst forth. From the ears came forth hearing, from hearing the quarters.⁸ Skin burst forth. From the skin came forth hairs, from hairs plants and trees. The heart burst forth. From the heart came forth mind, from mind the moon. The navel burst forth. From the navel came forth down-breathing,⁹ from down-breathing death. The generative organ burst forth. From the organ came forth seed, from seed water.

not pantheistic. Of course the orthodox view of the commentators that the *ātma* is the *īvara*, not *ūrva*, and the creation is *adhyaropa* from II, 4, 1, to II, 4, 3. This is not, it is admitted by Sayana clear from the text, but he appeals to Śvetāsvatara Upaniṣad, IV, 10, *mayam ita prakṛtiṃ vidyad*, and Brāhma Sūtra, I, 4, 23, *prakṛtiḥ ca pratyakṣaḥ destāntaraḥ* besides other passages equally irrelevant. In Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 1, *astāvata* the regular form occurs. The Astāvya Brāhmaṇa often has unsugmented pasts, see p. 36, Rohlfsing, *Sachs Ber* 1900, II 433. The next clause, here and II, 4, 3, may be interrogative or merely an expression of determination (so commentators and translators). For *apar*, cf. Atharvaveda VI, 23, 1, *Ind Stud*, X, 440, n 1, *J A O S*, XXV, 110.

² The translation of Max Müller, 'and it is heaven,' can hardly be right, and it is not supported by the commentators. It is true that heaven must come in somewhere, for it is sufficient if it comes in as a support, and so Rohlfsing and Deussen, with Colebrooke, Sitarāma, Rājārāma, and Roer take it. Anandātīrtha explains *amāṣa* as *maṣa* and the other worlds beyond the heaven where the waters were originally placed, 'the blue firmament,' Rājārāma.

³ This is the later *śūnyā* of the Vedānta. Anandātīrtha calls it Brahman, in accordance with the Viṣṇu legend. Cf. Hopkins, *Rel of India*, pp. 230 sq.

⁴ The five elements (Sayana), Brahman, &c. (Anandātīrtha).

⁵ The sense of *atapa*, to create by will, is pointed out by Śāṅkara, who (cf. Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt* I, 87 sq., 91 sq., Oldenberg *Religion des Veda* pp. 402 sq.) cites Mūṇḍaka Upaniṣad, I, 1, 9 *yajñaḥ jñānamāyamaṃ tāpaḥ*! The translation here is borrowed from Max Müller (cf. also *S B E*, LV, 28, n 2). For *yathānāṣam* below, cf. Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa III, 14, 8, Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa, II 13. There are sets of three, the organ, the activity and the natural phenomenon corresponding which is later called the presiding deity. See e.g. the Aṅguli, Mbh., XIV, 1119 sq. For this *śṛṣṭikrama*, cf. Chāndogya Upaniṣad VI, 2. Taittiriya Āraṇyaka, II, 1.

⁶ *Prāṇa* here means clearly the power of smell. Originally (1) it meant the breath in the widest sense from which it came to denote (2) life or the guarantee of conscious life, as frequently in II, 1-3. On the other hand, (3) it was narrowed down to denote one of five *prāṇas*, II, 3, 3 and these *prāṇas* were contrasted with *manas* and the *indriyas*, though in death or sleep the fundamental character of the *prāṇas* came out. (4) The sense 'smell' is an independent and not very common development. (5) Another development applies it to all the organs of life, e.g. eyes, nose, tongue see I, 3, 7, n 6. Cf. *Sāṅkhya Aranyaka*, p. 11, n 1.

⁷ Anandātīrtha explains them as Jodra, Yama, Varuna, and Kubera.

⁸ *Ajāna* here has the other meaning of down-breathing, not inspiration, but breathing.

2 These deities¹ being created fell into this great ocean² He troubled him with hunger and thirst. The deities spake to him, 'Grant us a place, where we can rest and eat food' He led a cow³ for them They said, 'This is not enough for us.' He led a horse for them They said, 'This is not enough' He led man⁴ to them. They said, 'Well done!'⁵ Man is indeed well done He said to them, 'I enter according to your places.'⁶ Then fire,⁷ having become speech, entered the mouth Air, having become scent, entered the nostrils The sun, having become sight, entered the eyes The quarters, having become hearing, entered the ears The plants and trees, having become hairs, entered the skin The moon, having become mind, entered the heart Death, having become down-breathing, entered the navel The waters, having become seed, entered the generative organ Hunger and thirst said to him, 'Grant us two a place' He said to them, 'To these deities I assign you, I make you sharers

of wind in the lower part of the body Cf on II, 3, 3 and II, 4, 3 Rājārāma takes it as 'air inhaled by mouth, not through nostrils' Colebrooke has 'the air drawn in by deglutition', explaining that swallowing was considered a parallel to inhaling Cf Z D M G, LV, 261, LVI, 156, J A O S LVII, 249

¹ This section really reverses the former section There *atman* produced the worlds then *purusa* and the deities. The deities now enter into *purusa*. Compare the common process in the Brahmanas where the *brahman* creates the world and then enters it, but here the deities have no creative power and the section only seems to show the reciprocal dependence (cf Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt.*, I, 218, 219) of the deities and the senses of the great cosmic forces and the microcosm I take the subject of action to be the *atman* throughout, so do Śāṅkara and Śrīvaṇa. Poir apparently takes *purusa* as subject of all save the first two sentences. Colebrooke apparently read *akhyachan* and so makes the *atman* alone subject and object in the sentences.

² This must mean the ocean of being, from which *purusa* is evolved. Sayana says into the *svaya*, but this seems less probable The *e* I, below *alanayoparisa* is the form in the Bṛhadaranyaka Upaniṣad while in Ta it nya Aranyaka IV, 23, *alanaya sa gīṣa ca* is found Cf Aitareya Brahmana, VII 13 *alanayoparisa*, Aufrecht, p 431, Bobblingk *Sachs Ber.*, 1900 p 418

³ Because it has no upper teeth says Sayana. He is, however, right in quoting II, 3, 2, as showing the real reason for the preference of man, as the most intelligent

⁴ The commentators Ānandatītha and Sayana who often follows him Colebrooke, followed by Roder Max Müller and Deussen explain this *purusa* as different from though allied to the *purusa* of II, 4, 1 This hardly seems likely and the confusion of thought is just as great on the former theory as on the latter The exact parallelism with II, 4, 1, of what follows is against their view For the particle *va* cf P A O S, Apr 1893 pp 21, 22

⁵ Śāṅkara suggests it may mean 'self made' (cf Max Müller's trans. (S B E LV, 58) of Ta it nya Upaniṣad II 7) because man is created by his own illusion, or that he is the 'abode of all good actions', which S Śārāma in his trans accepts Max Müller (S B E, LV, 20, n 4) equates *sva*⁸ and *svārta* as = deeds performed by oneself and believed to be good

⁶ Cf Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa I 18, 3, which may be borrowed

⁷ This means Sayana says that in the absence of the deity the faculties cannot work He quotes Brahma Sūtra, II 4 14 *pratyakhy adās tannam tadānmat* I Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa II 11 12 seems not unimportant of this passage

in them'. Therefore to whatever deity an oblation is offered, hunger and thirst are partners in it⁸

3 He thought, 'There are these worlds and the guardians of these worlds. Shall I create food for them?' He brooded over the waters¹. From the waters brooded over form² was born. The form that was born was indeed food. The food when created sought to go away³. He was fain to seize it. He sought to grasp \equiv with speech. He could not grasp it with speech. Had he been able to grasp it with speech, man would have enjoyed food by uttering its name alone. He sought to grasp it by scent⁴. He could not grasp it by scent. Had he been able to grasp it by scent, man would have enjoyed food by scenting it alone. He sought to grasp it by the eye. He could not grasp it by the eye. Had he been able to grasp it by the eye, man would have enjoyed food by seeing it alone. He sought to grasp it by the ear. He could not grasp it by the ear. Had he been able to grasp it by the ear, man would have enjoyed food by hearing it alone. He sought to grasp it by the skin. He could not grasp it by the skin. Had he been able to grasp it by the skin, man would have enjoyed food by touching it only. He sought to grasp it by the mind. He could not grasp it by the mind. Had he been able \equiv grasp it by the mind, man would have enjoyed food by thinking of it alone. He sought to grasp it by the generative organ. He could not grasp it by that organ. Had he been able to grasp it

¹ Sayana following Anandaturtha, explains that as hunger is mitigated by the knowledge of its (i.e. food's) proximity, or by hearing of it, so the senses all appease hunger and thirst. Sankara's view is that the sensations become eaters by sharing in the deities: i.e. fire, &c., in the body and in the world, so they share in every offering to a deity (i.e. the deity and the worshipper both eat).

² The five elements (Sankara and Sayana).

³ Form or organism, as Rajarama translates it, is natural, not something imposed on matter, and it plays no such part in Indian thought as in Greek. Even the Buddhist *rūpa* is not a pregnant conception.

⁴ Roer reads *madat*, 'crying' so Rajarama, and see next note. Sankara explains 'that mice &c. try to run away from ants that eat them. He takes *apghamsat* as 'it sought to run away,' and this is followed by Sayana and Anandaturtha and by Visvesvaranatha, besides being accepted by Colcbrooke Roer, \equiv Sitarama, and Rajarama, Max Muller, and Deussen. But that this is correct seems very unlikely. Rather it may mean, 'He sought to strike, grasp it' which idea is later developed in detail. This leaves the exact sense of *parat* difficult. If it is neuter of Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1117, Jaiminiya Upanishad Brahmana I, 2, 4, 6, 1, Katha Upanishad, II, 4, 1, Mauryaniya Upanishad, VI, 17, Orléans, J. A. O. S., XVI, 126. But if it is \equiv no purpose (cf. Atareya Brahmana, III, 46, 2, Jaiminiya Upanishad Brahmana I, 2, 4) a tolerable sense is made as masculine. But I prefer Bohtlingk's *atyapghamsat*, cf. Roth, *Z. D. M. G.*, LXIII, 106-111. If *emat* is nom., cf. Introduct., p. 56. In Manava Gṛhya Sutra, I, 17, 5, occurs *athasman dadhimadhu samadhinatah*, which Knauer (p. xlii) defends by quoting the Atareya Brahmana passage (VII, 22) and Kaṇḍikī Brahmana XVII, 2, and by the fact that *na* in Pali occurs on the nom. (cf. Muller *Pali Grammar*, p. 88). Lohtlingk, *Sachs. Ber.*, 1896 II, 155, 1900, pp. 418, 418, decides the use.

⁵ As above in II, 4, 1. For a rather similar list, cf. Jaiminiya Upanishad Brahmana I, 60.

by that organ, man would have enjoyed food by sending it forth alone. He sought to grasp it by down breathing. He obtained it.⁵ Thus it is Vāyu who lays hold of food, and Vāyu is he who lives by food.⁶ He thought, 'How can this be without me?' He thought, 'By which way⁷ shall I enter?' He thought, 'If speech distinguishes, if scent smells, if the eye sees, if the ear hears, if the skin feels, if the mind thinks, if down breathing digests, if the organ sends forth, what then am I?' Having split open the top of the skull he entered by that door. That door is called *rudrā*, the place of happiness.⁸ There are three⁹ dwelling places of him, three dreams, this dwelling place, and this, and this. Born he looked through all beings, to see whether any one wished to proclaim

⁵ *Vāyu* is derived from *ayati*. The use of this causal form is confined to this sense but is found both in Sāṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa. The sense is perhaps 'consumed' rather than 'seized'. Possibly *ayati* is the source (Monier Williams' *Dict.*), but this is less likely, cf. *J A O S*, LVII, 83, *Ind. Stud.* XLIII, 24.

⁶ Or he who gives life by food, as Savana and Ānandātītha take it, quoting Tīrthadaranyaka Upaniṣad II 2:1 *annam dāma*, IV, 3 6, and *Ānandātītha Upaniṣad*, III 2: *bhavana* describes the passage as *ānandānāma*. For the long series of conditionals, cf. Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar* § 950. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax* p. 366, Speyer, *Indische und Sanskrit Syntax* § 195. These cases are all normal: they refer to a past unreal condition for the act of creation is not conceived as continuous, and correspond to the Latin pluperfect subject or the Greek aorist indic. in protasis with *de* with aorist in apodosis. The form *agrahaḥ yat* is remarkable cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa VI 24 *parajagratīsam*, ibid., 35 *pratyajagratīsam*, and see Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 904 b 1069 a for other cases of the anomaly.⁷ The *Supanādhya* also contains the form *agrahīsam* Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* I, xxiii see *Mantrapāṭha* II, 8, 3 *agrahīsam* cf. Böhtlingk, *Z D V G*, LIV, 517, with Bloomfield, ibid., LVIII 127 *J A O S* LXX 135.

⁸ Śaṅkara illustrates by the metaphor: Unless the lord the city keep, the watchers watch in vain. There must be the soul in the body. Śāyana compares Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad III, 4:1. Contrast with Aristotle, *De Anim.*, III, 5 is interesting.

⁹ I.e. by the tip of the foot as in II 2:4 or the skull. Śāyana connects the former with the *harmendriyas* the latter with the *jñānendriyas*. Ānandātītha refers to a variant in Śaṅkara's commentary *an* or for *atā*. It obviously must have been wrong but it is worth noting that Śaṅkara's text was not very complete or certain. It is noteworthy that here we have no hint of *karma* (cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad III 2, 13 sq., IV, 4 3 5).

¹⁰ So called because connected with *hara*, says Ānandātītha. The *Jaiminīya Upaniṣad* Brāhmaṇa knows a *nāndāna saman* and *Sāmaveda*, II 651, a *nāndāna stoma*.

¹¹ These three are variously interpreted. Śaṅkara gives two explanations. The first is that of right eye inner mind and ether in the heart. Ānandātītha explains the mind as in the throat, and identifies the heart with the ether. He thus gets in his own commentary the true right eye throat, and heart, and so Colebrooke. Śāyana as often follows him rather than Śaṅkara, and after him cites the *Isaṇa Upaniṣad* III *netre jagratīsam turyāte tanike śrāṇam samā d'et i sūrutīam ārdraṇyā te* (al. *ārdraṇyāte*). Śaṅkara and the others explain the states as of waking dreaming and deep sleep for all are sleep as compared with true knowledge of *brahman* (cf. *Āyālya Upaniṣad*, XII). The other explanation is that referring to another birth viz. one's own body and those of one's mother and father, this is no doubt quite wrong but Śāyana reconciles the two theories by assigning two kinds of *samskāra*, *dīnasya* *vāde* and *jānendānānāde* to which the theories correspond.

another self¹¹ He saw this person only as the most widely extended *brahman*¹² I have seen it, so he said. Therefore he was Idandra by name, he was indeed

✓ ¹¹ Sankara does not explain this passage. Ānandātīrtha says that either he regarded it as clear or his copyists (cf. n 8) omitted it. His own explanation gives us a choice. (1) He identified himself with creatures because he did not see the true self, *āt* being used in the sense of *yamat*, or simply, he identified himself with creatures: he did not see the true self, *āt* marking the close of the *adhyarupa* section. (2) The *adhyarupa* ends with *atasaṁśa* *āt*, and with *sa jata* begins the *apamaṇa*. He examined the creatures separately, whether they had *svatā* *satta* or not, and concluded that 'there is nothing that I can call different from the true self'. *Vadīyama* is given for *avadīyat*. Sayana follows this one of Ānandātīrtha's explanations, using some of the actual words. Colebrooke has, 'What else (but him) can I here affirm (to exist)?' S Sūtrama reads 'How should he speak of any other?' and Roer has, 'How could he desire to declare any other thing different from him?' Rājarama, 'Can any (element) here call (the ruler) different?' Max Müller and Deussen render, 'whether anything wished to proclaim here another self.' This must be right, or perhaps the subject should be 'any person', the difference is, however, slight. This version is supported by Ānandātīrtha in his own commentary, *śa bhūtesu anyam matā 'nyam pratartakam avadīyat kim vadet*, says Visnu. *Vadīyat* cannot refer to the subject of *adīryakhyat* and *anyam* must refer to *ātmanam*. *Vadīyat* may be an intensive aor subj., or the juncture of a *desid* from the intensive, both rare forms (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, II 1019, 1023). Nilakantha thinks this passage is referred to in the Moksadharma Mbb., XII, 10060, no doubt wrongly, see Deussen's trans., p. 493. For *adīryakhyat*, *adīryakhyat* should certainly be read. The confusion between *āhy* and *āt* is very frequent in all sorts of MSS., cf. Weber, *Ind Stud.*, IV, 273, Hillebrandt's notes on Śaṅkhyasāstra Sūtra, IV, 12, 10, 13, 1, Gobhila, *Gṛhya Sūtra*, I, 3 18 (Oldenberg, *S B E.*, XXX, 21), Knauer, *Nanava Gṛhya Sūtra*, p. xxv. Sehtelowitz, *Die Apokryphen der Rgveda* pp. 174, 175, and at great length in his forthcoming work, *Zur Stammbildung*, &c., on *kṛchra*, *Z D M G.*, L. 42. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 136, *Ēpigr Ind.*, IV, 122, *prākhyūṣtam* for *praksūṣtam*. The Nruktā, III, 20, already recognizes it and uses it in connecting *āhya* with *ṛksa*. On the other hand T, a South Indian MS., has the correct *āsāt* though perhaps only by conjecture. Rājarama gives the form as Vedic for *adīryakhyat*, and no doubt a confused remembrance of such a form may have helped to keep the absurdity in the text when once it had forced its way in. *Vadīyat* he gives as *let* of *śvad*. For *ātma* he accepts the etymology from *āt*, the 'motor' or 'vital force' Geldner (*Vedische Studien*, III, 116, 117) adopts the etymology of Weber and Garbe (*Die Samkhya Philosophie*, p. 293) of *ātman* from *āt* and so denoting (1) the wandering wind, (2) the *samsarin* soul, whence come the other meanings, person, self, body, nature. It is quite possible that the root and the wind were deemed to be closely connected—there are plenty of parallels—but of course in this case we cannot take *samsarin* in the technical sense. The more usual derivation is from *śam* (Roth), while Deussen (*Allg. Gesch. der Phil.*, I, 1, 285 sq.) prefers to derive *ātman* from two pronominal stems. No explanation as yet offered is satisfactory, since none explains Vedic *ātman*, &c. (Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 61). Bobhtingh's conj. *anta dīśat*, 'to see if it referred to any one save himself,' is good, but not essential.

¹² The commentators all read *brahman* separately, and though the sense would be much the same this is better than to take *brahmatatamam* (with || text) as one word. The commentators and translators all agree it is for *tatatamam*, and Deussen compares *dūrnasprapataram* in Chandogya Upaniṣad, V, 10, 6. We may also compare *nabhamam* (= *nabhamam*) according to Max Müller in RV, V, 27, 3, see Oldenberg, *S B E.*, XLVI, 412. *Varunavayvitamam* for **vatamam* = V, 3, 2, though there the Jaiminya Upaniṣad Brahmana, I, 10, 1, reads *pari*

Idamdra by name. Him who is Idamdra they call Indra¹³ mysteriously. For the gods love mystery¹⁴

ADHYĀYA 5

In man¹ he is from the first as a germ². That seed is strength gathered from all the limbs and he thus bears a self in his self. When he connects the seed to the woman, then he causes it to be born. That is his first birth. The seed becomes the self of the woman like one of her own limbs. Therefore it hurts her not. She nourishes the self he has given her there. She, as nourisher, is to be nourished. The woman bears the germ. The man before the birth of the child and thereafter³ supports him. When he supports the child before its birth and

gataṇam, and for a large number of somewhat similar (but often doubtful) cases Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 290, II, 2, 128, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, pp. 38, 49. Bloomfield, *P A S*, April, 1893, p. xxxv, *A J P*, XLII, 416-418. Otherwise it might be translated 'just that' in accordance with Panini, V, 3, 93 for which see Bhāgarata Parāṣa, V, 26, 28 is also cited, so Bohtlingk, and in Chandogya, I c, **taṇa* is now read.

¹³ For Indra as a designation of *ātman* cf. II, 3, 2, n. 2. For *adurīyam*, Lévi p. 107.

¹⁴ The phrase here occurs in *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, III, 43, 1. *aty ā aksate parakṣam parokṣam* is the *śloka*, a similar but characteristically slightly different phrase occurs repeatedly in *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* VI 1, but not in I 1, Weber, *Ind Stud.*, XIII, 268, V, 127. Cf. also *Āitareya Aranyaka Upaniṣad*, IV, 2, 2, where Indra is mysteriously called *Indha* as the person in the right eye, for the same reason as here. Winternitz (*Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 161) happily compares the riddles found in the *Rigveda*, the *Atharvaveda*, and the *Yajurveda*. The gods require amusement as well as reverence. So also the gods must have animals to play with (Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 148, Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda* p. 74, and Keith *J R A S*, 1907, p. 936). Other examples of obscenity are *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, VI, 1, 2, 2, VII, 8, 1, 22 (Winternitz p. 177). Cf. also Winternitz, *Monistapathos* I, xux, 2. Śaṅkara sums up the result of this chapter in an interesting and polemic discussion of the *ātman* as eternal and unthinkable subject (W pp. 50-64 trans. by S. Sitaśāstra, pp. 39-49), but what he says bears rather on his system than on the Upaniṣad. See also Lévi *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, p. 38, n. 6.

¹ Śaṅkara following Śaṅkara thus sums up the result of the Upaniṣad in the introduction to this *Adhyāya*. There is (1) *brahman* undeveloped and truly real, (2) then *adhyātma* in (a) the fourteen worlds in *brahman*'s egg (b) *īśa* who regards the worlds as his body, (c) the *śatruyas* arising in his body, (d) the *preṇḍa* deities (e) the subjects of the *śatruyas* including man, (f) the food of the deities and its *apṛ* nification, (g) the three states of the self, (3) the *apṛ* nification beginning with *śa jātā* and ending with the end of II 4 3. This sect on takes up as regards other births than the present the question of the three states of the soul. This section seems to be referred to in the *Mahābhārata*, VII, 113, 10662, 1115494. Cf. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, VI 2, 2, 2. Lévi, p. 107. For the egg, cf. Gomperz, *Greek Philology* I 93.

² This simple and easy narrative should not, of course, be explained by the *śaṅkara* as Śaṅkara proposes, but is much earlier in conception. *Ānandabīṣṇa* explains the whole as a question of the different manifestations of *ātman*. The odd except *śa ā āra* and *ū* and *Rājā* punctuate the *śa āra*, but the *conjunction* and the *parallelism* of *śa āra* and *ū* are in favour of the other punctuation. The sense is the same. Bohtlingk's *śa āra* (= *śa āra* nam) is not essential.

³ The commentators here differ. Śaṅkara and *Ānandabīṣṇa* in his *śaṅkara* take (1) *janmano* 'ere as 'before birth', (2) *agra* ere as *pātmantram*, (3) *ādā* as 'after birth'. This seems preferable, except that *agra* ere must be considered as explained by *janmano* 'ere. *Ānandabīṣṇa* in his *śaṅkara* explains (1) as above; (2) as *agrayā*, *śatruyas* *agrayā*, (3) *ādā* as

thereafter, he supports in truth himself, for the continuation of these worlds.⁴ For thus are these worlds continued. This is his second birth. This self⁵ is appointed for holy deeds. The other self having done its duty and attained old age departs, and departing hence is born again. This is his third birth.⁶ A poet says (RV, IV, 27, 1), 'Within the womb, I learned all the races of these gods. A hundred brazen forts restrained me, but like a hawk I escaped swiftly downward.'⁷ Vāmadeva lying in the womb thus declared this. Knowing this, he

aśhakatena. Śāyana renders (1) *agra* etc. as *prasaśat* *prag* *eva*, (2) *janmano* 'gre as *prasaśat* *andhānu*, (3) *odhi* = *adhikata*ma, apparently borrowing this from *Ānandatīrtha*'s *bhāṣya*. The services before and after birth which Rājarama Ramakṛṣṇa Bhāṅgarāta alone recognizes, as apparently also Colebrooke, are explained as the mourning the mother and performing the usual ceremonies before and after birth. It is just possible, however, that *adhikata*mayati is the verb, and the reference is only to what is done before birth. Bobhtingk omits *agra* *cva*.

⁴ Contrast the late and elaborate passage in Kausitaki Upaniṣad, II, 15. The passage, Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brahmana, III, 11, is fundamentally different.

⁵ That is the son. The following passage is quoted by Śaṅkara on *Dhāḍaranyaka Upaniṣad*, p. 307.

⁶ Śaṅkara explains that as father and son are one *ātman* (cf. V, 3, 3), the three births are correct. Śāyana says either (1) the *ātman* being one, it has three births, two as son, one as father, or (2) the two births of the son have analogues in the case of the father and that of the father in the case of the son, so that each has three births. The third birth is taken by the commentators as rebirth in heaven, hell, or in the world of men. Probably, as there is no proof that the Upaniṣad knows the doctrine of transmigration, it refers to being born in the next world, an idea familiar in the Brahmanas (cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, pp. 168, 169, *Sanskrit Literature* pp. 223, 224) which differs essentially from transmigration, i.e. birth into this world again, see Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 294, 295, E. T., pp. 325 ff. Levi, pp. 96 n. 1, 97, n. 1, Hillebrandt, *Ved. Myth.*, II, 8, contra Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, II, 288, Bobhtingk, *Sachs. Ber.*, 1893, p. 93. For *agra* *gate*, see Wachernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, 1, 190.

⁷ This verse is very obscure in this connexion. Śaṅkara, Ānandatīrtha, and Śāyana all explain it as referring to the innumerable bodies through which Vāmadeva had passed until he obtained *mukhi* through knowledge. This meaning cannot be got from the passage. The context seems to show that it only means that Vāmadeva knew the three births of *ātman*, and so escaped and became immortal. The doctrine of *mukhi* is not apparently known to the writer of the Upaniṣad. If it were, it would be made clear. For the meaning of the verse in the original of Bergaigne, *Rel. Ved.*, III, 322. Eggeking *S. B. E.*, XXVI, xi, p. 1, Roth *Z. D. M. G.*, XXXVI, 353, Hillebrandt, *Ved. Myth.*, I, 282, and especially Bloomfield, *J. A. O. S.*, XVI, 124, who explains the myth as referring to Agni. When the cloud is rent in the storm, the lightning (*-hyena*) breaks from the cloud and simultaneously the Soma flows upon the earth. Sayana in his *Rgvedic commentary* follows this passage. On RV, IV, 26, 1, Śāyana says that Vāmadeva, who had in his mother's womb the knowledge of Brahman, sets forth that knowledge of the identity of himself and Brahman, in the verses *aham* *Ātman*, &c. (so Śatapatha Brahmana, IV, 4, 2, 21 and 22). So [Śāyana] on *Atharvaveda*, XVIII, 3, 15 *as khalu garbhavartha eva somo upanmatatrayāṇāṁ stvayā sarvadyajam annasamiddham*. Sieg (*Die Sagenstoffe des Rgveda*, pp. 76 ff.) holds, no doubt rightly that the idea is not found in the RV passage, but no conclusion as to the priority of the Śatapatha Brahmana, I c, can of course be drawn from the fact that no mention is there made of the legend, which may quite well have been known to the Śatapatha, though not referred to. His version

brahman,⁶ Indra, Prājapati, all the gods, the five great elements,⁷ earth, air, ether, water, lights, all these and those which are mixed with small as it were,⁸ seeds of various kinds, born of eggs, born from the womb, born from heat,⁹ born from ygerms,¹⁰ horses, cows, men, elephants, and all that breathes, whether it walks or

atistayāna, vundhāyāna, prakṛtāyāna, avipratāyāna, darāna, dhāraṇa, mānu prāṇānām talatvān mātā, brahmasūnam itatām, sarvapravāna, sarvāni deśānāni svarūpāni ca samam ramate, sarvākṛtā, sarvākāśtvām āsana amṛtananda vātanātrāta Sayana borrows from both, he refers *samyak* to *samyak*, *medha* to *grāhakatadārthakāraṇam*, *jaṭā* to *jaṭus* or as in Śaṅkara, *senikāṣṭhā* to *asemicāṣṭhā* 'pe vadunt samyaktvaṃ kālpanam', for the rest he follows faithfully Śaṅkara. *Tajajama* renders 'consciousness, direction, sagacity, intelligence, retentive power, understanding, courage, power of thinking freedom of thought, intrepidity, memory, will, capacity, vitality, ambition, obedience' Lehtlingk makes these subjects and *prajñatmetram* predicate

① This may fairly be construed as an assertion of the pre-eminence of knowledge. The parallel passage in the Kausitaki Upaniṣad, III, is clearly later for it combines elaborately the doctrine of *prajñā* (see II, 1-3 above) and that of *prajñā*. The relations cannot be reversed.

* Possibly masculine as Śaṅkara Anandātīrtha, and Sayana think, followed by Colebrooke, Roer, Śhāraṇa, Rajarāma, Max Müller, Böhtlingk, and Deussen. But this is not necessary nor likely in view of the notes below, and *Brahman (m)* is not found as a deity in the *Āitareya Brahmana* (but only as priest, p. 68). The occurrence in *Maitrayani Samhita* II 9, 1, is interpolated v. Schroeder, *Ind. Lit.*, p. 91, n. 1. *Mou Sansk. Texts* V, 323, finds the masc. in various Śatapatha passages, unnecessarily. But it occurs, e.g. in Kausitaki Upaniṣad, I, 3. The masc. is natural and is helped by the following mase.

* This passage is relied on by Deussen (op. cit. p. 168, E. T., pp. 185, 186) in support of his view (accepted by Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, III 217 sq., and Winternitz *Gesch. der indisch. Lit.* I, 208) of the lateness of the *Āitareya Upaniṣad*. But there is nothing in the expression itself to demand a late date, and the fact that the version in the Upaniṣad of the creation is so detailed instead of being a proof of lateness, may rather be considered a sign of early date, when the creation still was considered a veil act and the doctrine of the omnipresence of *brahman* as consciousness was not so fully developed. The passages *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* I, 4, 7, *Chandogya Upaniṣad*, VI 1, 3 both contain a reference to name and form, a conception familiar to Buddhism but not apparently at all early. The *Taittiriya*, II, 6, is evidently a mere résumé of a well known doctrine. But that Upaniṣad bears conspicuous traces of lateness: indeed it already quotes Ślokas very often and becomes quasi-metrical while it knows the *Atharvanguṇas* (II, 3) and has a much developed theory of the *akāśa* of *ātman*. For the elements (*akāśa* = empty space) see Böhtlingk, *Sachs. Ber.* 1900 pp. 149-151. Keith *J. R. A. S.*, 1909 July.

* Mixed with small (Śaṅkara). *For* he calls meaningless. Cf I, 1, 2 n. 3. III 2 6. Mixed from smaller portions (of the former) is Roer's version, which is no doubt the sense. The others of various sorts are opposed to the great elements. Colebrooke has: 'joined with minute objects and other seeds'.

* Śaṅkara explains as *yukadīni* which Anandātīrtha accepts. Sayana renders *krīmīdānīdāni*. The word does not occur in the *Chandogya Upaniṣad* VI, 3 1, but it is impossible to accept that as a valid proof of later date since such lists (cf those of the *prajñā*, I, 3 7, 4 1) vary enormously in the same book. In *śarajam*, cf *śara*, *Jaiminīya Brahmana* II, 430, 6 (*J. A. O. S.* XIX 100), Böhtlingk's *śarajam* is not necessary. For a similar list of *Anugata*, *Mbh.*, XIV, 1134.

* Rendered by Śaṅkara *vrkṣadīni*, by Anandātīrtha *bhūvaṃ mānuṣa jātāni vrkṣadīni*, and by Sayana *taruṇīdānīni*. Rajarāma has 'shoot born'. The form is normal and is not a case

You are the two pans² of the Veda May my lore forsake³ me not. I join day and night with what I have learned I will proclaim the real, I will proclaim the true⁴ May this protect me, may this protect the teacher. May it protect me, may it protect the teacher

tanish is a conjecture of his the text MSS. in I, 4, 4 have either *vanash* or *vans*, while, ibid 8, all save one (*vanash*) have *vans*. Only one Paddhati (cf p 19) has *vanim*, obviously an error for *vanash* (which of course (cf V, 1, 6, n 4) is the Sandhi of *vans ash*), if it is not a mere misreading of the MS. There is thus no real support for *tanish* (how exactly Dr Knauer would take it, I am not sure), and in the Manava Gbhya Sutra the simple Sandhi *matara* for *me + atara* is actually found in I, 3, 2 (so also I, 9, 11 *vastarasi*⁵, I, 11, 16 *vastuda*, &c, see Knauer, p. xxxix). Probably *vans* lead to the more intelligible (to the scribe) *vans*.

For *vans*, &c, Knauer, who does not notice the Atareya passage quotes Paraskara Gbhya Sutra, I, 3, 25, Taittiriya Samhita, V, 5, 9, 2, Taittiriya Aranyaka (Audhra text), X, 72, Atharvaveda, XIX, 60, 1. There is also the parallel version in Sankhayana Aranyaka, VII, 1, where *vedanamattarash* takes the place of *vedarya*, &c. This may perhaps mean 'hidden in', but probably we have a mere corruption, see my translation. The Mantras are no doubt old enough Colebrooke, who comments on the use of Mantra as applicable to part of an Upanishad, renders, 'May my speech be founded on understanding, and my mind be attentive to my utterance.'

¹ *Ananyasamartha*, Sayana. Colebrooke renders, 'For my sake (O speech and mind!) approach this Veda,' perhaps reading *manu*. Dr Schellertowitz takes it as 'navel'. The word in the Rigveda, I, 35, 6, &c (cf Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 39), seems to refer to the pin of the axle of a cart, and the metaphor is natural enough, cf Leumann, *Et Wort* p. 31.

² *prahash* may be a second person, or a problematic third person based on a false analogy (cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 889, Webet, *Berl Satz*, 1895, p. 830), or an error for *prahant*. Precisely the same difference of reading occurs in Khila, IV, 8, 5, *bruidan me mād prā hant*, where Peterson's MS has *hasit* and cf Manava Śranta Sutra II 1 2, 36 (*hasit*) with Taittiriya Samhita, III, 1 3, 2 (*hasit*), in the same phrase, *dikse ma ma hasit(h)*, and in Hiranyakeśi Gbhya Sutra, I, 6, 20, 1 *yathasat* for *yathasat* (Oldenberg, *S B E*, XXV, 189). Schellertowitz renders 'das von mir Gehörte möge man nicht verspotten vermittels des Erlernten,' taking *hasit* from *√has*. The long *a* would be unusual,⁶ but in any case a derivation from *√ha* seems preferable in point of sense and is supported by Atharvaveda, VI, 41 3, Taittiriya Aranyaka, IV, 42 (Anandakrama ed., pp. 352, 353). The translation will be literally 'O lore, forsake me not,' reading *frata* perhaps as the nom. is unusual, and the neuter voc. is perfectly well supported (cf Delbuck, *Altindische Syntax* § 66), and the reading *frata me* is easily corrupted into *frutam me*, cf Lanman's note on Whitney, *Atharva Veda*, XVIII, 2 3, Whitney, *P A O S*, Oct, 1887, § xxv, and my note in *J R A S*, 1907, p. 225, although the nominative can stand cf Winternitz, *Monistopäthe*, I, p. xvii.⁷ For the sense cf Atharvaveda, I, 1, 4, Taittiriya Upanishad, I, 4, 2.

³ From here to the end this is identical with the Taittiriya Upanishad, Śāksavalī, I, 1, or Taittiriya Aranyaka, VII, 1, 1. The sense of *alavatra* is no doubt, 'I work all day and night,' as Sayana takes it. Colebrooke renders, 'Day and night may I behold this, which I have studied.' In III, 1, 2, the next is used.

⁴ Compare, however, *sakye* which Whitney, no doubt rightly, reads in Atharvaveda, II, 27, 5 although the form elsewhere is always *sakye*, and III, 1, 6, n 5. *Akanti*, given as only grammatical by Whitney (*Roots*, etc., p. 203), is found in the Dakṣamaracanta (Bühler, *Ind Ant*, XXIII, 147).

⁵ See also my note in *J R A S*, 1908, pp. 1124-31.

ĀRANYAKA III

ADHYAYA I

NXT comes the Upaniṣad of the Samhitā text. The former half¹ is the earth, the latter half the heaven, their union the air, says Māndūkeya. The union is the ether,² so proclaimed Maksavya. 'For it is not considered independent,' and so I do not agree with his (Mānduka's) son,' he said. 'They are alike' and it is considered independent,' said Āgastya, for the air and the ether are both alike. So far as regards the deities. Now as regards the self. 'The former half is speech, the latter half the mind, their union is the breath,' so said Śuravira Māndūkeya. Then said his eldest son. 'The former half is mind, the latter half is speech. For by mind one first resolves and then utters speech. Therefore is mind the first half, speech the second half, and truth their union.' It is indeed alike³ with both father and son. This compact of mind, speech, breath, is like a chariot⁴ with three horses. He who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame,

¹ e g in *Agnim ile m is gurvarāpam ī uttararāpam*, and m: Samhitā (Sāyana). For all this Aranyaka cf. Śākhayana Āranyaka, VII, VIII, printed in Appendix, and my translation, pp. 41-56.

² *Ākasa* is rendered 'void' by Böhtlingk in his translations of Chandogya and Brhadaranyaka Upaniṣads see II 6, m 7 contra Whitney *P A*, Oct 1890, p. liii.

³ This is not at all easy. *Ākasa* (like *śukla*, II 1, 3, 8) seems to be passive because it is difficult to make out a translation either as *nīkītatam* (Sāyana) or *manyā* (Anandatīrtha). The subject must be *vajras*, and the sense must be as in *Sayana* (cf. Śākhara on Taittiriya Upaniṣad III 10, 4; Max Müller, *S B E* VI 63 n. 1) that *vajras* is included in *ākasa* and therefore is inferior to it. Anandatīrtha takes *gubhna* as referring to the fact that *ākasa* is the father of *vajras*. The subsequent identification he explains on the ground that *vajras* is the stronger. In Taittiriya Upaniṣad I 3 the earth, sky, ether (= *antarā* & *śāklara*) and *vajras* are given as the four factors. *Ākasa* is obscure. It may be a gen. dat. and refer to Māndūkeya or possibly a vague reference (cf. *Rigveda Prātilikhyas* I, 2) to the subject, helped by such genitives as that in V, 3, 1.

⁴ *Samana* is next, probably because *mate* is understood, or perhaps it is *ferm*. The solution is that the two views are equally correct, because in *upāsante* it is not things but words that are considered (Sāyana). Anandatīrtha rightly takes the last words as giving the opinion of Mahātareya. Otherwise they must be Āgastya's in which he concurs. Max Müller reads as *Sati* but it is not in B or the other MSS and it is merely a misunderstanding of the commentator.

⁵ They gave a similar result, and so are alike and equally justifiable, *no hy upāśantā taitītatam apakṣate*. For *manas* and *var*, see Lévi *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, pp. 39, 31.

⁶ *Vajras* is made the subject by Anandatīrtha. The real subject is clearly the meditation on the Samhitā. For three horses, cf. RV I 39 6 100, 17, VI 47 24, VIII 7, 28. The metaphor recurs constantly in different forms in Sanskrit literature e g Mbh, VI, 1477 sq. The analogy with the *Phœbus*, 246, is obvious. For *samhitā* cf. RV, III, 1, 7, Geldner, *Vedische Studien* I 164.

⁷ Anandatīrtha renders the children as *prajāna*, and the cattle as *vedas*. Sāyana with

glory, and the world of heaven. He lives all his days. So teach the Māndūkya.*

2 Then comes (the teaching) of Śākalya.¹ The first half is the earth, the second half the sky, their union is rain, Parjanya is the uniter. Thus it is when he rains strongly and continuously for day and night, then people say, 'Earth and heaven have united'. So far as regards the deities. Now as regards the self.

Śākhara regards this Upaniṣad as intended for persons who are neither fit for *mukta* (II, 4-6) nor even for union with *Īśānyagarbha* (II, 1-3).

* This section gives us the views of certain Māndūkya. The *Śākhara* occurs in *Rigveda Pratiśākhya*, § 200, and in the Purāṇa tradition (Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, II, 100 sq., III, 253). Schiefelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rigveda*, p. 12, has revived the theory that certain of the *Śākhā* represent parts of their *Saṃhitā*, but cf. Oldenberg's review, *Götting. Anz.*, 1907, pp. 218 sq., and my review, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 226 sq. The word Upaniṣad in this section clearly means 'secret doctrine'. This is certainly the earliest sense of the word (denied, no doubt, from teaching in the forest, which was done for the sake of secrecy, cf. *Introd.*, p. 15). I cannot accept Deussen's view (*Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 13 sq.) that the earliest sense was 'secret word' (a case like *rajanā*, &c.), then 'secret text', then 'secret sense' of a ritual action. The earliest sense may well have been 'secret meaning' of a ritual action whence it seems to me the other meanings are very easily derived. Deussen's theory is bound up with his view of the *Āstīyas* as propounders of a secret lore, as to which cf. *Introd.*, pp. 50 sq., III, 2, 6, n. 11. I agree with Deussen, however, and with Winternitz (*Gesch. der indisch. Lit.*, I 209, n.) in re-asserting Oldenberg's view (*Z. D. M. G.*, L, 458 sq.) of Upaniṣad as *upāsana*. See, however, also *Z. D. M. G.*, LII, 70 sq., and Max Müller's view in 1869 *Rigveda Pratiśākhya*, p. 12, Hopkins, *Act. of Ind. A.* p. 218.

A muddled version of this section occurs in the *Rigveda Pratiśākhya*, I, 2, 3. *Manuṣyaḥ saṃhitāḥ svayam āha tathakālam cāya. Mātariya eva samanadam anile cambare ca mātari-gastya. vyaparṣham tad eva || 2 || adhyatmakṛtān Śūrat, rāḥ tulat* ca vanmanasā vṛodanty dnyatṛyaḥ | sandhāḥ tveerīṇam mṛdhujam tadanti laudhākaraccaranam ca pratnam || 3 ||* See Max Müller, pp. 11-12. The *Śākhayana* has, VI, 2, an attempt at an improved version, reading in one MS *parakṛtā* in both cases. Dobttingk, in the smaller *Dist.*, I, 130 renders *vyaparṣhya* as 'identical' but this makes no sense. The reference in the *Pratiśākhya* is of course valuable as giving Śaunaka's date as a *terminus ad quem* for the lowest date of the *Āraṇyaka*.

¹ It refers to the case of *śaṅ* acc. Panini VI, 6 37, 1 n. where vowels like *a* become *y* before *ś*. A fourth party is introduced. Śākalya must of course be the great grammarian to whom the *Saṃhitā* is ascribed, and this gives us not a very ancient date for this Upaniṣad but it need not have been written long after Śākalya. Rather it seems to be early. For Śākalya's date see *Introd.*, p. 71. He must probably go back to 700 B.C. Geldner (*Indische Studien*, III, 144 sq.) considers that Śākalya must be identical with Vāgdeha Śākalya mentioned in the *Saṃpātha Brāhmaṇa* VI 6, 3, XII, 6 9 (see Weber, *Ind. Stud.* IX, 277 sq., *Indian Literature*, p. 33) and identified with the maker of the *paṇḍita* by the *Viṅṇa* I, 1, 1, 5. He was therefore a contemporary of Āruṇi and Vāyavalkya in opposition to Oldenberg's view (*Prolegomena*, pp. 371 sq.) which refers him to the end of the *Brāhmaṇa* period.² Weber (l.c.) thinks that *Śākalya* in the *Āstīya Brāhmaṇa*, III 43 5, refers to his school, but the

* *śulā* which is wrong in fact, illustrates the inaccuracy of the reproduction.

² Geldner evidently takes a much more respectful view of the antiquity of these ages than I would. I think it quite possible to hold that Śākalya and they belong alike to the end of the *Brāhmaṇa* period. On the other hand I think Haeckel's dating (*U. A. Z.*, pp. 106 sq.) wrong, see *Z. D. M. G.*, 1908 pp. 229, 230. *J. R. A. S.*, 1908 p. 264.

Every man is egg-like,² there are two halves, they say;³ this is the earth, this is the heaven, and between them is the ether, just as there is the ether between earth and heaven. In this ether⁴ the breath is fixed, as is the air in that ether.

reference is too far fetched to be worth consideration—indeed such comparisons hinder rather than aid progress. The evidence of the Vāya Purāṇa is worthless. Identifications are easy and obvious, and we cannot tell that we have a piece of tradition at all. The fact that the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa does follow the rule of Śakalya (Panini VI, 1, 118), that *a* before *r* becomes *ṛ* and that *a* may remain, cannot prove that Śakalya is prior to it. The reverse may be the case. As Geldner admits, the RV.—and the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa is in the same position—do not follow his rule (VI, 1, 127) as to *i* & *ī* before dissimilar vowels, and we are left with grave doubts whether Geldner's view that Śakalya was merely to Panini the author of the *paṭiśāṭha* and author of the Pratiśāṭhya is sound. The fact therefore remains that when Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 46, recognizes *śhāvira uttīkī* as the pronunciation, it cannot have before it Śakalya's text, unless we admit (which is too bold) that the Sāmhitā is later than Śakalya. I prefer therefore, Oldenberg's date of Śakalya, and I would lay stress on the fact that in the Aranyaka he is Śhāvira Śakalya⁵ in the Brāhmaṇa Vīdagdhā. These names are too distinct to permit of identification. The Śakalya of the Pratiśāṭhya is likewise Śhāvira and must be the same as the man here.⁶

¹ *Andam* (later *andā*, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 171, Macdonell, *Pedie Grammar*, p. 33, n. 14) *andapadīram tarna-rāṭirat chandasah* (Savana). The neut. is not worthy as comparatively rare in Sanskrit. Cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 13 *ārpanam ha du kīta*, also II, 3, 3, *madhyam atma* &c. Parallels are common in Greek and Latin (*ova dyōdū volūnciparū* Monto, *Homeric Grammar*, p. 166, *malum mela videtur* (est) mors Cicero, *Thuc.* I, 3, 9). The use is thus substantival rather than adjectival as is clearly felt in the case of *madhyam*. See also the striking case, Bhādaranyaka Upaniṣad, I, 4, 3 *idam t idam ardhairgalim ita roah* (so Bohtlingk, *Chrestomathie*, p. 357, Max Müller, *S B E*, XV, 85, n. 2). In *it* *an* there is a lengthening sound also in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa in prose (Aufrecht, p. 477) with *it* also. Cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* I, 372, II, 3, 8, n. 9.

² 'They say' can hardly refer to the following words, as Max Müller takes it, though this is partly supported by the last words of the section.

³ *Tasmin haṣmin* is certainly curious. The Śaṅkhyāna parallel VII, 3, 11 is a correction and throws no light. The MS. evidence is strong and Ānandadeva renders it as *tasmin ha ṣmin*. Perhaps *smi* stands for *asmi* (cf. Müller *Pali Grammar*, p. 24) and *ha* is the particle. No root or base *ha* exists from which *haṣmin* could naturally be formed. Sayana ignores the point and may possibly have read *tasmin asmin* as does Rajendralala, but this is unlikely. The correction *haṣmin* leaves the error unexplained. It is to be noted that in the Sunahśepa legend, Aitareya Brāhmaṇa VII, 13 the MSS. read *it ha sma aty iya* which Aufrecht keeps in the text and gives (p. 431) as one of the grammatical errors of the Brāhmaṇa. The parallel Śaṅkhyāna text has merely *it*. Bohtlingk in his *Chrestomathie*, p. 351 and *Sachs Ber.* 1900, p. 418, amends to *haṣma* and claims that Śāyana bears this out. But Śāyana's note while showing that he took *smd* as equivalent to *asmi* is not conclusive though it tends to show that he had *asmi* before him, just as he seems to have read *tasmin asmin* here but arguments from his silence are dangerous. He ignores *smasmas* in II, 3, 7. I do not think it impossible that this *smi* and the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa's *sma* are parallel phenomena of an attempted simplification of

⁴ It is true Śhāvira does not occur in III, 1, 2, but I do not think it is reasonable to take the Śakalya of that passage as different from him of III, 2, 1, 6, as does e.g. Weber, *Indian Literature*, p. 50.

⁵ On *h m* see Max Müller *Ag. via Pratiśāṭhya* pp. 7-9.

Just as there are those three lights in heaven, so there are these three lights in man. As there is in heaven the sun, so there is the eye in the head. As there is in the sky the lightning, so there is the heart in the body. As there is the fire in earth, ■ there is the seed in the member. Having thus represented the whole world as the self, he said, 'This is the symbol of the earth, this of the heaven'. He who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven. He lives all his days¹.

3 Then come the reciters² of the Nurbhaja. The Nurbhaja dwells on earth the Pratrna in heaven, the Ubhayamantarena in the sky. Then if one should rebuke him who recites the Nurbhaja, he should reply, 'Thou hast fallen from the two lower places'³. If one should rebuke him who recites the Pratrna, he should reply, 'Thou hast fallen from the two upper places'. But there is no rebuking him who repeats the Ubhayamantarena⁴. For when he unites the words, that is the Nurbhaja form,⁵ when he pronounces the two syllables pure, that is the Pratrna form. This is the first. By the Ubhayamantarena both are fulfilled

the forms of the base a. Possibly the production of such forms may be due to the analogy of *adamin* (RV) and of *sar at* (Chandogya Upanisad). Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 495 fin. See however, also Böhtlingk's remarks in his *Grammat Abhandlungen im Aitareya brahmana*, Leipzig 1900, where he regards the irregularities noted by Aufrecht I ■ as due to misreadings of the text and I fully recognize that undue reverence to such texts is absurd. On the other hand old forms do disappear and cf. perhaps the use of *ima* and *imanam* Maitrīyaṇī Upanisad VI 7 II 6 and the Vedic *imama* (Pāṇini VI 4 141. Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik* I 61). There is also the elision of *a* in *manu* Mantrapīṭha I 13 9 (= Hiranyakeśi Gṛhya Sūtra I 16 3) see Winternitz edition I xxvii. Wackernagel I, 318.

¹ These sections 1 and 2 may be compared with Taṭṭirīya Upanisad I 3 which treats the *saṃhita* with reference to the spaces (earth heaven ether wind) lights (fire sun water, lightning) knowledge (teacher, pupil knowledge training) generation (mother father child begetting) and the self (lower jawbone upper jawbone speech tongue). This elaborate system must be later than the Aranyaka. Cf. Max Müller *Āgveda Pratiśāhya* pp. iii sq.

² Or recitations of. The Nurbhaja is the Saṃhita the Pratrna the Iada and Ubhayamantarena the Krama Pīṭha. Max Müller (see his *Āgveda Pratiśāhya* p. 11 and *Lectures*, p. 11) first pointed out the importance of this passage. Cf. also Oldenberg *S. B. E.*, LVII 145 sq. *Prolegomena* p. 180. Macdonell *Sanskrit Literature* p. 58. It is summarized in Pratiśāhya I 4. see my *Sinhāyama Aranyaka* p. 45 n. 3. III 1 2 n. 8.

³ *Ayo tharitarahāya* is clearly a case of irregular Sandhi cf. Atharvaveda IV, 1 1 *prithyāntirahā* III 3 4 n. 11. Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik* I 316 317. Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar* pp. 64 65. *J. A. O. S.* LVII 99-103.

⁴ It is the perfect form, e.g. Sayana says in the Saṃhita in *ayam* 1 2 the *ī* = *stāvita* + *prātis* in the Pāda they are both *anvāṇa* (cf. Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar* § 90, Macdonell *Vedic Grammar* p. 79 n. 7).

⁵ Sayana explains *nirḍa* (as *ānṛpāntarā purvottara a'dau yatim*). Max Müller thinks it may refer to the arms of the words being cut off as it were or with two arms stretched out the two words forming as it were two arms to one body. In the following *ayo tādā* is clearly the reading though S and R in the commentary vary reading *ayo tādā* and *ayo tās*. The *Sinhāyama Aranyaka*, VII 3, has the correct form.

He who desires proper food should recite the Nirbhuya, he who desires heaven should recite the Prātina, and he who desires both should recite the Ubhaya-mantarena. Then if another should rebuke him who recites the Nirbhuya, he should reply, 'Thou hast offended the earth, the deity. The earth, the deity, will strike thee.' If another should rebuke him who recites the Prātina, he should reply, 'Thou hast offended heaven, the deity. The heaven, the deity, will strike thee.' If another should rebuke him who recites the Ubhaya-mantarena, he should reply, 'Thou hast offended the sky, the deity. The sky, the deity, will strike thee.' Whatever he says to him¹ or says in reply to him, that shall assuredly be fulfilled. But to a Brahmin one must not say anything save what is auspicious. Only in exceeding² prosperity may one say ill to a Brahmin. 'Not even in exceeding prosperity may one say ill to a Brahmin, let Brahmins be honoured,'³ says Śrāvira Māndukeya.

4 Then come the imprecations¹. Let him know that breath² is the beam. If any one rebuke him who has become breath in the beam, then if he thinks himself strong³ he says, 'I have grasped the beam, breath, thou canst not overcome me who grasp the beam, breath. Let him then say, 'The beam, breath,

¹ *bruvan ta bruvanām va*. This may perhaps be taken as I have taken it as equivalent to 'whether he speak to him or speak in reply'. This is quite a simple construction. But it is not so taken by the commentators. Sayana renders *bruvan* as equivalent to *bruvanām*, and takes the second part as *va abruvanām*. This is followed by Max Müller. Anandakīrtiśa interprets it as *bruvan vā abruvan ta bruvanām va abruvanām ta*. For similar curses, cf. Śaṅkhayana Aranyaka VII 10 and Chandogya Upaniṣad II 23 3.

² Sayana takes this as permitting a curse on a Brahmin in the case of great wealth (such wealth being sinful). Anandakīrtiśa denies this and carries on the negative. Thus Śrāvira's dictum confirms this. This is less probable. Max Müller accepts Sayana's view that the man is to say 'Let them be known to Brahmins'. It is simpler to take it as in the text: *For na cana* cf. V, 3 3. Delbrück *Altindische Syntax* pp. 544 sq., Channing *J A O S* XIII xviii. Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa II 77 (*J A O S* LV 240) *na te śarīraṇa cana grhaṇaṁ grihīyanti* and Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, IV 14 5. The rule that *na* precedes seems true for the Brāhmaṇa prose.

The two accs. with *brū* (for *brū* cf. Bloomfield *A J P*, V 180, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* I 182; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar* p. 36) are said by Delbrück (*Altindische Syntax* p. 174 cf. Speyer *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax* p. 8; Gieddke, *Der Accusativ im Veda* p. 265) not to be found in the Brāhmaṇa language, which this passage disproves. *Brū* is expressly mentioned as governing two accusatives in the Kāṇḍa cited by the Kaṭhaka Vṛtti in Farns. I, 4 51, where a much more marked case than that here (where the second acc. is merely a pronoun) is adduced, viz. *manasāham dharmam brūis*.

³ Sayana takes this as a noun of agency like *mādhujaprasādak* in III 1, 3. Anandakīrtiśa says *aimano jñānasya mārthyaśāntarānākti prabhuḥ acyanta ite śarīrāḥ*.

⁴ Cf. Śākalya's view, III, 1 2. The metaphor is from house building. The opt. below is clearly indefinite (like the subj. in Latin and opt. in Greek), see III 2 1, 2 2 and see my note on the Kaṭhaka *J N A S*, 1909. For *vaṇḍa* see Zimmer *Alt Leb.* p. 150.

⁵ The construction is curiously changed below to the accusative unless, in is possible the other person is meant. But see *St Petersburg Est s v man* 3. The nominative is,

will forsake thee' But if he thinks himself weak, he should say to him, 'Thou hast not been able to overcome he who have been fain^a to grasp the beam, breath : Breath, the beam, will forsake thee' Whatever he says to him or says in reply to him, that shall assuredly be fulfilled But to a Brahmin one must not say anything except what is auspicious Only in exceeding prosperity may one say ill to a Brahmin 'Not even in exceeding prosperity may one say ill to a Brahmin, let Brahmins be honoured,' so says Śuravira Māndūkya^b

§ Now the reciters of the Nirbhūja say, 'The former syllable is the former half, the latter the latter half The space between the former half and the latter half is the union' He, who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven He lives all his days Now Hrasva Māndūkya says, 'We that recite the Nirbhūja say that the former syllable is the former half and the latter syllable the latter half, but that the union¹ is the space between the former and latter halves in so far as thereby one produces the union and distinguishes accented and unaccented and separates the mora and what is not' He, who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven He lives all his days Now his son,

however, quite regular, see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 268, Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax* §§ 308 and 39 Cf also the idiom *krino* (acc) *rupam* *kr* (Taittiriya Samhita, V, 2, 6, 6 VI, 1, 3, 1, 6 5, 2, 4, 1, 4 7, 1, VII, 1, 6, 2, 3 4 Brahmana, I, 1, 3 3, Aitareya Brahmana, VI 38 see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XII, 111) The construction with the nom (cf Delbrück, *Vedische Syntax*, pp 104 sq Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax* § 33) is no doubt rare in later Sanskrit, but I have found it in an independent passage in Anaśatirītha and the analogous use of the gerund is found in the Ramayana, &c Cf the curious phrase, Manu VIII, 91 *eko 'ham aśmīty ātmanam manyase Chakṣuṣam* in Rajendralāla is merely an assimilated or altered into *anuvāra* The error of B in reading *chakṣuṣam* shows how little dependence can be put on this MS As to *ala* cf III, 2, 4 a 10 *Evam* is here in apposition to *pranam* but I agree with Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 136, that the strict rule (Bohlingk *Z D M G*, XLII 182) cannot be proved for Vedic or Sanskrit

^a *Samadhisṭam* is of course the const indie of the desiderative of the root *dha* Max Müller translates *samadhisṭantam* as a participle, but this is impossible Cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1035 a, *Revis. &c*, p 249, f A O S, XIII, lxx

^b These cases are just intelligible, but the cases in Śākhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, 8 and 9 offer serious difficulties As the text stands the first case is that of rebuking another, when if strong the rebuker (this must be the subject) says to the other, 'Thou hast grasped the beam or beam but canst not overcome me who am fain,' if weak, he says, 'Thou hast sought to grasp, but couldst not' In the second case the sense must be (reading *paraṁ* of making *paraṁ* mean 'the subject' & 'the man' & 'me', 'he' & 'man' who holds 'that' & 'gown' & 'vest' & 'a' & 'has' & 'rejoice', 'I have been fain to grasp the beam, breath, thou canst not overcome one who is fain,' if the rebuker is strong If not, he says, 'Thou hast sought to grasp, but couldst not.' Other renderings are quite possible and the text can be altered (e.g. read *samadhiṣṭam* in VII 8), but it is not possible to be certain of the sense, see my trans., pp 44-46

¹ i.e. this view is differentiated in one or two points from the view above Cf Śākhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, 11-13

Madhyama, his son by his wife Pratibodhi,¹ says, 'One pronounces these syllables by their letters, neither separating entirely nor uniting absolutely,'² and the mora which is between the former and latter halves and indicates the union = the sliding. I consider therefore the sliding to be the union.' A Rū says this also (RV, II, 23, 16), 'O Brhaspati, they know nought higher than the sliding.' He, who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven. He lives all his days.

¶ Tarukya³ says, 'The union is formed by the Brihat and Rathantara Sāmans. The Rathantara is speech, the Brihat breath.'⁴ By these two, speech and breath, the

¹ *Metronymics* like this were inevitable where polygamy was possible. They do not prove matrarchy or anything similar. A similar instance is the famous *hṛna* Derakṣputra of Chandogya Upaniṣad III, 17 (not ? as in Max Müller) 6, who is the subject of an interesting discussion in Garbe's translation of the *Bhagwadgītā*, and cf. *J R A S.* 1907, pp. 975 sq., 1908 p. 173, n. See also Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 169. A child sometimes, if illegitimate, was named after its mother, e.g. Satyalīma Jabala, Chandogya Upaniṣad, IV, 4. For a long list of metronymics of a curious character see Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, VI, 4, 30-32. The reading of B is a mere error in an inaccurate NS. Max Müller suggests Pratibodhi as the correct form, and this seems the form in the Sāṅkhayana. For the *ī*, cf. however Macdonell, *Pāṇini Grammar*, p. 75. Pratibodhi is a recognized name in the Gāṇa *śilpi*. For other metronymics of Fleet *J R A S.* 1905 pp. 637, 638, Hopkins, *J A O S.* XIII, 105, 370, n. 1; for a discussion of matrarchy as affecting the Aryan Hellenes, see Farnell, *Archaeol. Religions Wissenschaft*, 1904, pp. 70 sq. and *passim*.

² The reading is clearly *anekikṛtur*. *Ehikṛtur* is an easy but bad blunder. Sayana explains that you must not (1) pronounce *taru* as *taru+st* nor (2) as *taruṣṭ*, but (3) as *taruṣṭ*. This cannot be meant. It is really intended that you should pronounce so as to give a sound of *st* together. Compare the fact that in the so-called elision of Latin both elements were distinctly preserved in pronunciation (cf. Lindsay *Latin Language* p. 144), as in modern Spanish. Cf. also Deussen *Śaṅkhya Upaniṣad* p. 214. This passage is of particular interest in confirming the notice in the Ṛgveda Pratiśākhya III, 8 (200) (Max Müller's edit., p. 127) that Mandakya laid down the use of the circumflex in the Prāṇa Sandhi (e.g. *a+e*, &c.) as well as in the Abhisandhi Sandhi (*e* or *e+a*), and the exceptional cases of *i+e*, in which the circumflex is regularly laid down and the fact that the *a* is not merely elided generally recognized by the Pratiśākhya (Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 324, Macdonell, *Pāṇini Grammar*, p. 104). So *Prāṇi* VIII, 2, 6, has *svanto vānandit padidm*, and see Wackernagel, I, 292-293, Macdonell, p. 104. The requirement of the circumflex is only intelligible on the *anekikṛtur* theory.

The form *anekikṛtur* is interesting. *Fli+akr* is found in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1093 and contrast III, 2, 3. *akṛ+akṛ* occurs in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad IV, 4, 2 in the sense of dying, and cf. Maitreya Upaniṣad (Max Müller, *S F E.* XV, xlii) *ima ekakṛoḥ parasmai*, cf. also Jacob, *Concordance*, p. 168. For RV, II, 23, 16, cf. Geldner, *Falsche Studien*, III, 68.

³ Tarukya is more probable than Tarkya because the alteration to Tarkya is natural, the word occurring above on I, 5, 2. Possibly Tarukya is merely a case of *svarakṛti* cf. Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik* I, 50 sq. It is clear that Sayana read Tarukya as he derives it from Tarukṣa. The Ānandīyama corrects it into Tīkṣa without warrant. The Śāṅkhayana Āraṇyaka, VII, 19 has Tarkya, cf. *Amṛtali Brāhmaṇa*, XXV, 9.

⁴ These Sāmans are used in the Prāṇa Mōtra of the Agniṣoma.

union is made' Tarukṣya guards³ (his teacher's) cows for a year for the sake of this Upaniṣad. For it alone does Tarukṣya guard the cows for a year. AṚṣi says (RV. A, 181, 1, 2), 'Vasistha bore hither the Rathantara, Dharadvāja carried hither the Brhat of Agni'⁴. He, who thus knows this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven. He lives out all his days. Kauntharavya says 'Speech is united with breath, breath with the blowing air, the air with the All gods, the All-gods with the world of heaven, the world of heaven with brahman. This is the gradual union'. He, who knows this gradual union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven, just as does this union. If he for the sake of another or for his own sake recites (the union) let him know as he is about to recite,⁵ that this union has gone up to heaven,

³ This is a quaint piece of human nature. There are plenty of parallels of Chandogya Upaniṣad, IV, 4. The omission of the second sentence in B is clearly a slip, showing how untrustworthy is the MS when uncorroborated. For the *anustupajambhū*, cf. Bṛhadaranyaka Upaniṣad, I, 3. 2. Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 177, 4; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 92; Geidner (*Vedische Studien*, III, 33 n) finds such a loc in RV, I, 6. 9 *śānu amūm rīṣya gṛāh Rakṣayati* is a hist. pres. The middle here gives clearly the idea of personal interest (cf. Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 166 b; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 236 sq.). For the hist. pres. cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 302; Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 172; *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 317; Brugmann *Griech. Gramm.*, § 156, and especially his paper, *Berichte der Königl. Preuss. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, 1883, pp. 169 sq.; Giles, *Comp. Phil.*, § 247. The present tense essentially denotes what is continuous or progressive (cf. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, pp. 62-63) as opposed to the momentary, and that whether the verb has the sense of an action or a state. The historic use with a particle of time is Homeric, but not the simple historic present though it is found in the earliest Latin (e.g. the epitaph of Lucius Cornelius Scipio (B.C. 298) *cepit, immitit omne(m) Lucianum optulisse adiunctum*) and must be Indo-European.

The acc. of time is common, see *Introd.*, p. 56; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 170, 171; Gaedicke, *Der Accusativ im Veda*, pp. 175 sq.; Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 28; Hopkins, *A J P.*, XXIV, 7.

⁴ These Sīmans are required to accompany the important Pravargya. Cf. *ṣaṣṭhādhyāya Aranyaka*, p. 48, n. 6.

⁵ *abhiyāyāṣan* is an extraordinary form. Whitney, *J A O S.*, XIII, 122, takes it as an acc. ind. but I cannot make sense of this. To take it as at first seems most natural as a mistake for a future participle (*āyāṣan*) is faced with the difficulty that *āy* gives only *āyisy* as the future in accordance with the established rule (Pāṇi I, VII. 2. 70) that roots in *r* take intermediate *s* (Max Müller, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 332), and that even if *āy* were assumed *āyisy* would need explanation though *s* and *y* are constantly confused in MSS (e.g. *grastyam* and *gratam*, *Mantrajam Samhita*, IV, p. 138; Whitney, *P A O S.*, Oct., 1837, p. 225; *accyāṣan* and *accyāṣan*, *Chandogya Upaniṣad*, I, 11, 2; Whitney, *P A O S.*, Oct., 1890, p. 11; *nīṣāṇa* and *nīṣyāṇa*, *Āitareya Brahmana*, VII, 16; Aufrecht, *Āitareya Brahmana*, p. 431; above I, 1, 5); *āyāyāṣ* and *āyāyāṣ*, *Chandogya Upaniṣad* Max Müller, *S E E.*, XV, xiv, n. 1; Knauer *Atomica Gṛhya Sūtra*, p. 225, and occasional longs are formed, e.g. in *saktye*, *Atharvaveda*, II, 27, 2, for *saktye*, &c., *astak* (Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 887). There remains only to take *abhiyāyāṣan* as an aorist participle (without of course any past sense), 'while reciting,' cf. e.g. RV, II, 4. 7 *dhātā ad vṛtīm*. But such forms are also very

and that so it will be with those who know it (and become) gods. So will it come to pass. He, who thus knows this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven. He lives out all his days. Pañcalacanda⁴ says, 'The union = speech'. 'By speech are the Vedas composed, by speech the metres. By speech friends are united, by speech all beings, therefore = speech all this'. Now⁵ when one repeats or speaks, breath = in speech, speech then swallows breath. When one is silent or in sleep, speech is in breath, breath then swallows speech. They swallow each other. Speech indeed is the mother, breath the son. A Rṣi says (RV, X, 219, 4), 'There is one bird,' he enters the sky, he sees this whole world, with ripe mind I beheld him nigh in hand; the mother absorbs him, and he the mother'. He, who thus knows this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven. He lives out all his days.

note The form *abdhakryote* in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (= *abdhakryaṣṭi*) may be explained perhaps by the cases of irregular lengthening above, and by the (Epic) use of middle terminations for active (*J A O S*, XXV, 132), rather than as a causative passive as in the Dict. In *Atharvaveda* XVIII 2, 38 the editions both read *vidhaktām* and the pseudo-Saṃyana apparently so read though he renders by *uḥan*, but the parallel passages, RV, X, 16, 7 and *Taittiriya Āraṇyaka*, VI, 1, 4 have both the correct *vidhakyām* (Whitney, *Translation of Atharvaveda*, p. 846), and the accent proves clearly that *vidhaktām* is incorrect. Macdonell (*Vedic Grammar*, p. 87 n. 1) suggests that in the case of *yokte*, *vidhaktām*, *sakṣe*, *muktām*, the *y* has dropped phonetically, cf. *J A O S*, XLV, 147.

śafvat tatha syat might of course mean, 'may it ever endure' (as taken by Max Müller), but the usual use of the phrase in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* supports the rendering above adopted, e.g. II, 21, 2 *ya enam lotra brūda vaca vajrena yajamanāya granam syagat prama anam haryati śafvat tatha syat*, 22, 3, 23, 2 3 29 7, IV, 7, 7, VI 23, 15, 26, 6, Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 343 n. 1 (for the construction with *śafvat* there mentioned, cf. *Saṃkhayana Āraṇyaka* I, 8). Eggeling on *Saṃpātha Brāhmaṇa*, V, 4, 3, 2 (*S B A.*, XLI, 98, n. 2), now adopts 'wob' as the regular equivalent of *śafvat* at any rate in the *Brāhmaṇas*, and see also Oertel's note on *Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa*, I, 54, 3. Saṃyana takes *śafvat* as a part of the protasis. In any case the sense is very much the same.

sa or *sa yad* is of course not a particle but the demonstrative. The cases in which Max Müller (*S B E*, XV, 110, n. 7 on *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, II, 4, 7) and Delbrück (*Altindische Syntax*, pp. 215, 216), following the *St Petersburg Dict*, find *sa* = a particle are merely instances of an ordinary anacoluthon, and do not prove that *sa* was ever felt as a particle. Precisely the same *khon* is common in early English and no one there thinks of 'he' as a particle, see Kellner, *English Syntax*, pp. 68 sq. Correct Caland, *Über des Rg Sutra des Baudhāyana* p. 46.

⁴ Pañcalacanda must mean Candā (no doubt Prākṛit for Candra, cf. *Atharvaveda*, II, 14, 1 (Cāṇḍā)) of the Pañcālas, as Saṃyana takes it. The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, VIII, 23, knows a king, Darmukha Pañcāla.

⁵ This is the proof of the nature of speech as other than and distinct from breath. Their activities are different. *Aṇyo'nyam* is very interesting as already it tends to become a separate word, though it still is here two words, see Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, 1, 321 sq.

⁶ This verse is more unconstrued even than usual. He enters the sky, it is said, as wind, the world he sees as *prama*, he is seen close in the heart (Saṃyana). On the *√rā* of the RV verse cf. Hopkins, *J A O S*, XXVIII, 125 sq.

Then comes the Prajāpati union.³ The first half is the wife, the latter half is the husband. The union is the son. The act of union is the begetting. This union = Aditi. For Aditi is ॥ whatever there is, father, mother, child and begetting. A Rś⁴ says this also (RV, I, 89, 10), 'Aditi = mother, = father, = son'. He, who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven.⁵ He lives out ॥ his days.

ADHYAYA 2

Śhivira Śakalya says that breath is a beam,⁶ and that as the other beams rest on the main beam of the house, the eye, the ear, the mind, the speech, the senses,

³ Proclaimed by Prajāpati (Sayana), but see Śāṅkhayana Āraṇyaka VII 16. Cf. Taittiriya Upaniṣad, I, 3, 8, and on III 1, 2. *Prajānana* occurs in the concrete sense in RV, III 29, 1 (Oldenberg, *S B E* XLVI, 305).

⁴ This verse is cited and explained in full in Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa I, 41, which is in fact parallel. For Aditi cf. especially Oldenberg *Religion der Veda* pp. 203 sq., Macdonell *Vedic Mythology* pp. 120 sq.

⁵ Taittiriya Upaniṣad I c, 7 contains after *brāhmaṇacarcana, amṛadgena sudargena lokena*, where S. Sitarāma renders 'all kinds of food'. Cf. for this section Śāṅkhayana Āraṇyaka, VII, 14-16 18 19.

⁶ This Adhyāya (cf. Śāṅkhayana Āraṇyaka VIII 1) deals with meditations on the several classes of letters. The construction *yatha syuk—samahatā* is noteworthy. For the verb understood cannot be considered as other than an indicative, so that the optative = the first clause must be indefinite. The same force seems to be found in V, 1, 4. *prastūthapayati—yada—śrāmyet* Śāṅkhayana Āraṇyaka II, 16. *śad yatha vraye palun anarjyargatena paritayet evam evatish padmanangash sarvan kaman ubhayaśch parigrhyatman dhaita*, VII 1, &c. Anāreya Brāhmaṇa V, 34 4. *śam yady etesam trayanam ekamūt akumavi adhyā—śhauet taryati Vamadaṇṇaya śteis prayasatish* Maṇu, VIII 3, 1, 78 (other examples in Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax* p. 349). So with *śdtha* Delbrück p. 350, with *yathā*, &c., *ibid* p. 351. So in *kṛtakṛyāś syuk* in Sayana's introductions to the RV, curiously misunderstood by Peterson (*Āgastī Handbook*, p. 126). The use differs distinctly from but is easily derived from the use of the opt. with either an opt. (potential) (cf. the use in Avestan, Jackson *P A O S*, April 1896, p. 187, Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.* II 372) or an opt. (imperative) in the apodosis, since in either of these cases the future tense is primarily present, whereas when an indie. forms the apodosis the sense is clearly merely indefinite. The use, especially as here in sentence, = common in Homer where the subj. with primary and the opt. with secondary tenses have both this sense (cf. Mounier, *Homeric Grammar*², pp. 258 sq., 269 sq.), is found in the subj. in early Latin prose as well as verse in which Greek imitation is always possible (e.g. Cato Major, *de Mor.*, *ingenium prope uti ferrum est ut exerceat conteritur, nisi exerceat rubigine contrahit*), in early English (Halliwell, *English Syntax*, p. 239) &c.

The use of the past part with or without copula (Introd., pp. 64, 65) is significant. Delbrück (*Altindische Syntax*, pp. 394 395), followed by Speyer (*Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 176) regards the use as corresponding both to imperf. and aor., but while of course it is dangerous to dogmatise on matters which ultimately depend on a delicate analysis of a language so remote as Vedic Sanskrit, it seems to me that there is a very clear distinction between (1) the aor., the tense of which has just happened, (2) the imperf., the tense of narration,

the body, the whole self, rests on this breath. 'Of this self the truth is like the sibilants, the bones the mutes, the marrow the vowels, and flesh and blood, the fourth part,' the semi-vowels,' so says Hrasva Māndūkya. We have,² however, learned that the number was three. Of those three, bones, marrow, and joints, there are three hundred and sixty (parts) on this side and on that side. These make up seven hundred and twenty. Seven hundred and twenty are the days and nights of the year. This self³ then, which consists of sight, hearing, metre, mind, and speech, is like the days in number.⁴ He, who knows thus this self, which consists of sight, hearing, metre, mind, and speech, is like the days, obtains union, likeness, and nearness to the days,⁵ becomes rich in sons and cattle, and lives out all his days.

2 Then comes Kauntharavya. There are three hundred and sixty syllables,⁶ three hundred and sixty sibilants, three hundred and sixty unions. What we have called syllables are the days, what we have called sibilants are the nights, what we have called unions are the junctions of the nights and days. So far as regards

and (3) these forms with participles which express a completed action whose results persist into the present. Of course many actions can be regarded from either point of view and differently described, but that is not to say that the effect is not different when different forms are used. To take some of Delbrück's instances RV, I 81, 3 *nd trd an Indra hdi cand nd jaid nd jantjate* the sense is not either 'was born' (imperf) or 'has just been born' (aor), but 'exists, having been born', in Taittiriya Saṃhita II 6 9, 3 *et detā avitvā prajyato vaś pāratat itnd tē no nāgachāt gandharvāś vai pīry amonur it,* which Delbrück gives as an case of the part corresponding to an aor the sense is clearly different between the continuing absence of the Soma and the one definite past act of the Gandharvas in stealing it. The real tendency of the Mantra and Brāhmaṇa is to assimilate the part to a present though, as is the case with all the expressions of past time in the Mantras, occasionally it may have a narrative sense (e.g. RV, III 48, 23 *Pīnya dīgdhā sakṣi p(ya)*). The present sense—yet with the past action—is very clearly seen in cases like Bhādderata VIII, 47 *prathamayāni va stulāḥ | ardharce dyant ca dhruvi ca Atimau collare tatāḥ ||* It is not *stilyante*, for the actual praising is over (antant is regularly used of the Bṛ), and yet it does not mean 'were praised'.

² Max Müller takes *anyat* as 'the rest', but it rather means 'the other, the fourth'.

³ This view is apparently Śākalya's (Sayana), the first three being his, to which Māndūkya adds a fourth. The threefold view, with *ghṛiṣ* for *stara*, *tyajyama* for *sparta*, is found in II, 2, 4 where the difference of terms denotes a difference in dates.

⁴ Anandavṛtha explains all this of Viṣṇu as usual.

⁵ The symbolism of the year is common in all religions, cf., e.g., Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States* IV, 284-285.

⁶ Cf. the Khila MS (B) at end (fol. 191^a—Schiffelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rgveda*, p. 258) *etdant evd darddnam sarāṣṭam sāyayā aye salohitam āmūte yā evānu ved ān svadhayim adhitē*. For the compound, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* II, I 149, 150.

⁷ Syllables are vowels, sibilants consonants and their unions the Saudhī (Sayana). Sayana takes *sarā* as separate, to explain how it comes to III = 360. But though the construction is illogical it is regular in the Brāhmaṇas (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 430 b, cf. for *īakṛt*, Pischel, *Prakrit Grammar*, p. 409), and *sarā* should not be printed apart as in S.

the gods. Now as regards the self. The syllables which we have explained with reference to the gods are with reference to the self bones, the syllables which we have explained with reference to the gods are with reference to the self marrow, the marrow is indeed the real breath, for it is seed, and without breath seed is not effused. Or if it is effused without breath, it will decay and will not produce. The unions which we have explained with reference to the gods are with reference to the self joints. Of these three,* bones, marrow, and joints, there are five hundred and forty parts on this side and on that. They make one thousand and eighty, and one thousand and eighty² are the rays of the sun. They make the *brhata* verses and thus day. Thus the self³ which consists of sight, hearing, metre, mind, and speech is like the syllables in number. He, who knows thus this self, which consists of sight hearing, metre, mind, and speech, is like the syllables, obtains union, likeness, and nearness to the syllables, becomes rich in sons and cattle, and lives out all his days.

§ Bādhyā⁴ says, 'There are four persons, the person of the body, the person of the metres, the person of the Veda, and the great person. That which we have called the person of the body is the corporeal self. Its essence is the incorporeal conscious self. That which we have called the person of the metres is the collection of letters. Its essence is the letter 'a'⁵. That which we have called the person of the Veda is that by which one knows the Vedas, Rgveda, Yajurveda, and Sāmaveda. Its essence is the Brahman priest. Therefore should one choose a Brahman⁶ priest who is full of *brahman* and can discern flaws

It is curious as § points out that no comment is made on the similar passage in III, 2, 1. For *kanudā*⁷ of the Dhātupadha root *kanu* which Franke (*Zeitschrift Orient. Journ.*, VIII, 323) compares with Greek *κνυδω* Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik* I, 170. The name seems not to occur elsewhere, except in the parallel passage in Śaṅkhayana Āraṇyaka VIII, 2.

* The words inserted by B are quite out of place here and show how little that MS can be relied upon. For *suṣṭhāna* of Atharvaveda II 12.7. Roth, *Z D M G*, XLVIII, 202. For the construction of Baudhīyana Dharma Sūtra II, 17, 22, 37. *J R A S*, 1909 contra Bühtlingk *Sachs Ber* 1892 p. 197.

² This extraordinary doctrine *Siyana* can only support by the Atharvans passage (Traṭina Upaniṣad, I 8 = Matsi Upaniṣad, VI 8. Bloomfield, *Index Concordance* p. 2002 a) *śatāra rājanā śatāśaḥ varṇam mahā prajāḥ prajānam mīlayaty eva suryaś*, which he explains includes by denotation the eighty. There are 2080 syllables in thirty *brhata*.

³ *Viṇu* according to Anandakīrti, who has considerable difficulty in working out the details of his interpretation here.

⁴ Bādhyā is undoubtedly correct. *Paśhyat* is merely a slip of Pīṇḍarāṣa's, and did not deserve record in Mot & Williams' *Dut*. *śaś(g)at* is read in Śaṅkhayana Āraṇyaka, VIII, 3.

⁵ Cf II, 3. 6. The precision in the use of the aorist is to be noted, cf. *Introd.* p. 60.

⁶ The Brahman priest is required to guard the sacrifice and sit in the South (the place of the dead), Śatapatha Brahmana, XI, 2, 8, 7. Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 141, n. 2. He is not here in any way connected with the Atharvaveda (the later connection is probably due to his employment (Winternitz, p. 139 n. 2) in the household ritual which is found mainly in

It hath filled heaven and earth and the sky 'The sun is the self of all that stands and moves' This I regard as the regular ² *Sambhita* ³ composed, thus says Bādha. For the Bāhvryas consider him in the great hymn, the Adhvaryus in the fire, the Chandogya in the Mahāvratā rite. They see him in this earth, in heaven, in the air, in the ether, in the waters, in plants, in trees, in the moon, in the constellations, in all beings. Him they call *brahman*. The self which consists of sight, hearing, metre, mind, and speech, ⁴ like the year in number. He, who recites to another the self, which consists of sight, hearing, metre, mind, and speech, and is like the year,

4. To him the Vedas yield no milk, he has no part in what his teacher has taught him. He knows not the path of virtue. A Rv. says this also (RV, X, 71, 6) 'He who forsakes the friend who knows his friends' in speech he has no part. What he hears, he hears in vain, he knows not the path of virtue. This means that he has no part in what he has studied and that he does not know the path of virtue. So a man who knows this should not⁵ lay the fire for another, nor sing the Sāmāns of the Mahāvratā for another, nor recite the Śāstras of that day for another. Only⁶ may he recite for a father or a teacher, for that is done for oneself. We have said⁷ that this incorporeal-conscious self and that sun are one and the same. Where these two are separated,⁸ the sun is seen like the moon,⁹ its rays do not manifest themselves,

² All the above must be Bādha's view, just as III, 2, 2 gave Kaṇṭharavya's views. The following alludes to the fact that the Adhvaryas' mystic speculations centre in the Agnicayana, cf. Eggeling, *J B E*, XLIII, xxv.

³ The section runs on in a way that cannot be early. V, 1, 1 and 2 is precisely similar, and the present section division must remain of doubtful (though early) date. The divisions of the Śāṅkhayana are similarly illogical. For the loc of Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 205.

⁴ Sayana points out that Taittiriya Aranyaka, I, 3, II, 15, reads in this verse *sakṣivṛdān*, a point overlooked in Bloomfield *Index Concordantiae*, p. 700^b. Sayana's reference does tend to show that he also wrote a Taittiriya Aranyaka commentary, which on other grounds might be deemed very doubtful (cf. III, 2, 3 n. 5).

⁵ I.e. not as Adhvaryu, Udgātṛ or Hotṛ priest. It is impossible to square the total prohibition here with V, 1, 5, which (see n. 5) contemplates a breach of the rule but it agrees with the opinion of some⁷ (cf. V, 3, 3 see n. 1 on that passage).

⁶ A frequent exception. Cf. V, 3, 3 n. 1.

⁷ III, 2, 3. The relevance of this passage is not obvious. Sayana takes it as a reflexion induced by the idea of the attainment of *brahman* in the brief space of life, whence omens as to the duration of life are inserted. The connexion of sun and self is elsewhere used to give omens of death. In *Bṛhadaranyaka Upaniṣad*, V, 4, 2, the sun appears as white only to the man about to die. The parallel passages in the Śāṅkhayana are VIII, 7, and XI, 3, 4.

⁸ This is not very logical, as there is no reason why the separation of the two should be a sign of death. The rest of the signs are clearly old folklore ideas pressed into service. For the extensive literature on Vedic superstitions, see Hillebrandt, *Kutsal Edebiyat*, pp. 167 sq., 183-185, Hatfield, *Andasatdāksam*, *J A O S*, XL, 202, &c., Bloomfield,

know that this is so. Next let him cover his ears and listen, then there is a sound as of a burning fire or of a chariot. If he does not hear that sound, let him know that this is so. Next when the fire appears blue like the neck of a peacock,¹¹ or when he sees lightning in a cloudless sky, or no lightning in a cloudy sky, or in a great cloud sees bright rays as it were, let him know that it is so. Next when he sees the ground as though burning, let him know that this is so. So far as regards the visible signs. Then come the dreams.¹² He sees a black man with black teeth, he kills him, a boar kills him, a monkey jumps on him; the wind carries him swiftly along, having swallowed gold he spits it out, he eats honey, he chews stalks, he carries a single lotus,

in other languages. Cf. Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 284, *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 487, Aufrecht, *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 431 my note *J R A S* 1909.

The Maitreya Upaniṣad (Max Müller, *S B E*, XV, xiv) has a passage which may be reminiscent of this text *agnir vaitanaro . tasyaśo ghoro dhātate yam* (wrong reading ?) *śat kṛmav apidhaya kṛmāḥ sa yadokṛmānyan bhavati nauman ghoraṁ kṛmāḥ*.

For *upadeśa*, *mīra* which denotes literally the noise of going and is particularly in place here, cf. *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, IV, 9, 3. *Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa*, I, 243, *Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa*, I, 37, 3, with Oertel's note, *RV*, I, 74, 7, with Oldenberg's note (*S B E*, XLVI, 94), Schmidt, *K Z*, XXV, 55. Scheffelowitz (*Zur Stammbildung in den indo-germanischen Sprachen* § 9) compares *RV*, IX, 77, 4 *urūdyd*, which he considers as going back to IG *paço*, cf. Greek *πρῶτος*. The construction above *driyate* and *adikkhyeta* in parallel uses and below *driyate pūyen na pūyen pūyeta* are decidedly curious (cf. *Introd.* p. 63). The temptation to amend to *driyeta* is very strong and on the whole I incline to think that it would be dangerous to insist on these examples. The case of *upadeśa*—*driyante* differs, for the two verbs are not parallel. The first is an instruction, the second expresses categorically the result (and *driyante* may have helped to bring about the incorrect *driyate*). In III, 2, 4 where *upadeśa* and *āha* occur, the *āha* is very strange, and one would like to take *śakṣyaty āha*—*śakṣyaty* as two sentences both dependent on *driyate*. There is, however, the real difficulty that *a—/ha* would be a strange combination, and the division of the sentences is also curious though no more curious than the *āha*. I suspect some corruption of the text. Śāyana renders differently. He takes the whole as one Mantra and supplies *dhātate* as a subject for *āha*, and so in the next sentence he interpolates *dhātate āha* in sense. In the numerous passages in the *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa* which are more or less parallel (see the ref. cited in III, 2, 6 n. 5), no such *āha* occurs, and *śakṣyaty* has no prefix. But probably *a—śakṣyaty* must go together. *āha* might, of course, be taken as a first person and made part of the quotation (cf. Speyer § 178), but this is not likely, and for the indef. opt., cf. III, 2, 1, n. 1.

¹¹ *Mayuragrīvaś* is perhaps intended by the reading of B *mayuragrīvaś anṛge* (but *Saṅkhyāna* has *mayuragrīva* when it can be 'red'), and undoubtedly *grīvaś* is the form alone recognized by Panini and usual in the earlier literature *J R A S*, 1906 pp. 916-919. Probably the reading was originally *mayuragrīvanṛge* by an incorrect Sandhi for *mayura grīvaś*. For similar irregular Sandhi, cf. Bühler, *S B E*, II xli (from *Āpastamba*), Macdonell, *Praśastiśruti*, I xxvii, and *V*, 3, 2, n. 9, III, 1, 3, n. 2. For the next portent, cf. Hirschel, *Indische Studien*, I, 112.

¹² The plural must be right. Cf. Markandeya Purāṇa, XLIII, 181, Hillebrandt, op cit., p. 184.

¹³ 'Red' = colour (Sayana), for red as unlucky, cf. *Z D H G*, VI, 117.

¶ Now Kṛṣṇaharita¹ proclaims this Brahmana² as it were regarding speech to him³ Prajapati, the year,⁴ after creating creatures, burst. He put himself together by the metres. Because he put himself together by means of the metres, therefore is it the Samhitā. Of that Samhitā the letter *n* is the strength, the letter *s* the breath, the self. He who knows the verses in the Samhitā and⁵ the letters *n* and *s*, he knows the Samhitā with its breath and its strength. Let him know that this is life-giving.⁶ If he is in doubt⁷ whether to say it with an *n* or without an *n*, let him say it with an *n*. If he is in doubt whether to say it with an *s* or without an *s*, let him say it with an *s*. Hrasiṃ Māndūkeya says, 'If we repeat the verses according to the Samhitā, and if we say the teaching⁸ of

must be taken that the theichneumon is a synonym for what is very piercing: the nearest approximation to this idea is the passage in Atharvaveda, VI 139 5 (cited in Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 86), which refers to the ichneumon (m) skill in chopping up and then restoring his work.

¹ A son of Harita who was dark in colour (Sayana), cf. Hiranyadant Vāids, II, 1, 5. A Kumara Harita (so, not Harita) appears in Bhādarānyaka Upaniṣad, II, 6 3, IV, 6 3, VI, 4, 4. Weber (*Indian Literature* p. 50) reads Harita, and the lawyer is always so called (*ibid.*, p. 269) even in Aṣṭamā Dharma Sūtra I, 10, 19, 12-16. On the other hand Vārtika 8 on Pāṇini I 1, 73 recognizes Haritakāśi, and Pāṇini IV, 1, 200 Haritayana as names, where Harita appears. Weber's Harita here is therefore probably wrong and Śākhayana Āranyaka, V III, 11, has *kṛṣṇaharita*.

² Brahmana here means secret doctrine like Upaniṣad. *Loc. cit.* seems to be used to indicate the somewhat unusual sense, the Śākhayana version has *eva*, cf. I 1, 2, n 3, *J A S*, 1908, p. 2193 n 1. Sayana in his commentary repeatedly has phrases like *antaryamīnā*, the secret doctrine of the *antaryāmin*, see III, 2, 4, n 18, and cf. the name of Bhādarānyaka Upaniṣad, 1, 4 (*gaurāṇḍakabrahma*), Max Müller, *S B E*, XL, 25 and the common *īśyotiṣa brāhmaṇam*.

³ To his pupil or son (Anandatīrtha and Sīyana).

⁴ The reading of B, *samatsarum* (see Introd. p. 3) must be a correction to improve the sense. But it could never have been corrupted into *samatsarak* Prajapati as the year is a Brahmanic commonplace (for its deeper significance, see Eggeing *S I E*, XLIII 22 sq.), e.g. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, II, 17 2, VI, 19, 7. Maitreyanī Samhitā I 20 B, Kauṣṭaki Brāhmaṇa, VI, 18, Śākhāyana Āranyaka, I, 2, &c. The phrase *Prajapatiḥ prajāḥ sṛjati tyasramāda* is frequent in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VI-IX, not in I-IV, Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, VIII, 268, and for a similar case cf. II, 4 3, n 14. One might translate 'he is the year'. Cf., however, Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, V, 2, 1, 1 and 2. The confusion of *tyasramāda* and *īśa* is another example of the confusion of word and consonant so common in Śākhā MSS. Cf. Leaman in Whitney's *Translation of the Atharva Veda*, pp. 57, 1045, J. Huetel, *Tentativeyāyā*, I, p. xvi, Roth, *Z D M G*, XLVIII, 106-111.

⁵ This is the literal rendering. Sīyana takes it, 'Who recites the verses thinking of the *n* and *s* which accompany the Samhitā'.

⁶ To the Samhitā (Sayana) or perhaps to the reciter, if not to both.

⁷ Sīyana takes it, 'If a pupil ask his teacher' but this is unnecessary. The question is, he says, whether the reflection on the Samhitā is to take the differences of *n* and *s* into account or not.

⁸ Sayana refers this to Śrāvastī's doctrine, III, 2, 1. For *upāśāna*, cf. Kauṣṭaki Brāhmaṇa, XIV, 1, Śākhāyana Āranyaka, I, 1, where Dr. Friedländer renders 'I need then I, generate I'.

Māndukeya, then the letters *n* and *s* are obtained for us' Sīhāvira Sakalya¹ says, 'If we repeat the verses according to the Samhitā, and if we say the teaching of Māndukeya, then the letters *n* and *s* are obtained for us' Then the seers, the Kāvaseyas, knowing this,² say, 'To what end shall we repeat the Veda, to what end shall we sacrifice? For we sacrifice breath in speech,³ or in breath speech. For what is the beginning, that is the end' These Samhitās let no one⁴ tell to one who is not a resident pupil, who has not been with the teacher for one year, and who is not himself to become a teacher. Thus say the teachers⁵

¹ The sayings are identical, and apparently this is intended to denote that the doctrine received universal acceptance. The passage may indicate (cf also Sāṅkhayana Śrauta Sūtra, IV, 10, 3 where Sakalya is younger apparently than Māndukeya) that the Māndukeya Sakha had its Samhitā text before Sakalya produced the Pada Pāṭha, which is quite likely.

² This is a clear proof that the holders of the Aranyaka doctrine rejected sacrifices or recitations as means of knowledge, cf Bhādarāyana Upaniṣad, I, 5, 25; Jāṣṭakī Upaniṣad, II, 5; Chandogya Upaniṣad, V, 21-24; Taittiriya Upaniṣad, II, 5; Deussen, *Phil d Upanishads*, p. 63. A Tora Kāvaseya *parulita* of Janamejaya occurs in Khila I, 9, 6 and m—as already noted by Colebrooke, *Essays*, I, 72, see Oldenberg *Z D M G*, XLII, 230 sq—the Aitareya Brahman, IV, 27, VII, 39, VIII 21. For the spelling cf Schiefelowsky *Die Apokryphen des Jgends*, Adilinda p. 190. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* I, 239. Winternitz (*Gesch der indisch Lit*, I, 199) uses the story of Javasa as the son of a non Brahmin (Aitareya Brahmana II 39) as a piece of evidence in favour of the theory of the attribution to the Hantiryaś of philosophic speculation over the origin of the doctrine of transmigration (cf. Introd. pp 50, 51, Garbe, *Beiträge zur indischen Kulturgeschichte*, pp 129). He argues that the Brahmins merely accepted and made these doctrines their own by adopting them along with the doctrine of the four Āśramas. This all seems very doubtful. That among the priests none should rise superior to the sacrificial cultus is contrary to all religious history. That hermits, &c., were originally not of the priestly caste is a mere theory and not a probable one. Winternitz view leads him (p. 202 n. 1) to adopt the improbable theory of Aranyaka as a text to be studied by Vaisnavas for which he quotes the (late) Aranya Upaniṣad (Deussen *Sech u Upanishads* p. 693) and Ramaraja (Thibaut, *S B E*, \LVIII 645). Cf Introd., p. 16. It must always be remembered that the Brahmanas contain already in germ all the ideas which make up the fundamental doctrine of the Upaniṣads, even the doctrine of transmigration is prefigured in the doctrine of repeated deaths in the other world. It is impossible to explain why the Brahmins became so completely the bearers of the *atman* doctrine if it was not theirs *ex initio*. Professor Macdonell has told me that he concurs in this view, which thus gains great weight, and see my notes *J R A S*, 1903, pp 838-863, 1141. The Kāvaseyas are cited by Śaṅkara on Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (ed. Roer, p. 257) as opposed to works, Weber *Ind Stud.* II, 458.

³ Cf Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brahmana I 2, 6.

⁴ Cf V, 3, 3, Weber, *Induan Literature*, p. 49, n. 35.

⁵ Mahidasa, &c. (Anandasturtha). Cf I, 1, 1, n. 5, II, 3, 5, n. 4. Probably the plural is only *ministers*.

ARANYAKA IV

ĀśVALĀYANA (Śrauta Sūtra, VII, 12, 10) gives the following account of the purpose of the Mahānāmni verses. On the fifth day of the *prsthya* six day ceremony, at the midday pressing of the Soma, corresponding to the Niglevalya Śāstra, the Udgātṛs sing sometimes the Śākvara Sāman as one of the Prsthā Stotras,¹ and then² use the Mahānāmni verses as the basis of the Sāman. These number nine, but for the purposes of the Sāman they are made into three, each consisting of three verses. These verses are recited *adhyardhakāram*, that is, first one and a half verses are recited, then comes a pause, then the remaining one and a half, followed by the syllable *om*. Then are recited the nine *purita padāni*, additional verses. These may either be recited simply straight on as they stand in the text, or the first five may be made into two sets of five syllables each, thus

Etā hi eva i ev i hi Agniṣu i the *hi* being taken without Sandhi, the last four *puritapadāni* being repeated without a pause in the middle. See also Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, X, 6, 10 and comm.

The Mahānāmni verses occur in the Āraṇjya Samhitā and in the Nageya Śākhi at the end of the Pūrnarika of the Sāmaveda, and as one of the Khilas of the Rgveda, see Peterson, *Second Report*, p. 97, Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rgveda*, pp. 134-136. They are referred to in the Bhṛhaddevata, VIII, 100, Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, X, 6, 10, Rgvidhāna, IV, 25 and Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, II, 11, 12, &c. From these sources, and from Baudhāyana, cited in Oldenberg, *Prolegomena* p. 509, n. it appears that they followed directly upon the verse *īc cham* 30r, which, according to the Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 5, 9, is the end of the Rgveda Samhitā (in the Bāskala recension), and, according to Narayana on Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 5, 9, is the end of the Bāskala recension.³ It is not, however, quite clear what this means, since *īc cham* 30r occurs as the last verse of two Khilas, V, 1 and 3, in Scheftelowitz's edition, viz the *tamyānam* and *pradhīranam* Khilas, and the three Khilas, V, 1-3, the second being the *nārhaṣṭam*, have 5+3+7=15 verses. The view of

¹ For these see especially Eggeling, *S B E*, LII, 22 sq.

² The Śākvara is normally based on Samaveda, II 1151-1153 (Sayana and Mahidhara cited by Eggeling p. 22 n. 2).

³ Cf. also Oldenberg's note on Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 5, 9 and *Ind. Stud.*, LV, 150.

Oldenberg, who had not⁶ the evidence of the MS of the Khilas before him, was (*Prolegomena*, p 502) that the Samhita ended with the first *tac cham yor*, i.e. with Khila, V, 1, and Schefstelowitz (pp 11, 132) holds that this is correct. Oldenberg, however, held (p 509) that the Mahanāmnī verses followed directly after *tac cham yor*, and (p 501) expressed the view that the following ten verses were some of them modern. But of the direct evidence for the immediate sequence of the Mahanāmnī verses, cited by Oldenberg, the Rgvidhāna alone fully bears him out, for the Khila MS has the Mahanāmnī verses after the *pradhvārdnam* Khila, and this is probably the meaning of Brhaddevala, VIII, 94, as interpreted by Prof Macdonell. It is an easy conjecture that the Rgvidhāna, which has other coincidences with the Brhaddevala⁷, followed that work, but misunderstood the word *caturtham*, which most probably must mean 'the fourth of the hymns after X, 190'. This fact weakens greatly the force of Oldenberg's argument from the modern character of the last ten verses, and in point of fact it is difficult to deny that the verse *tac cham yor* is modern in appearance, and that it need not be separated in time from the last seven verses. For the second *tac cham yor* being the end of the Samhita in the Baskala recension, we have the clear evidence of the commentator on the Caranavyūha,⁸ who actually cites the verses. Dr Schefstelowitz considers that the commentator is untrustworthy, and later than Sayana, but this appears very doubtful. We know, he argues, that the commentator explains the eight extra hymns attributed to the Dākala Śakha by the Anuvakanukramanī as being seven of the Valakhilyas and the *samyānam* hymn of fifteen verses but the number should be ten, as the *samyānam* hymn is really composed of three hymns. But it is difficult to maintain that it is impossible that the fifteen verses, despite their difference of contents, were not regarded in early days as one hymn, for several of the Rgvedic hymns are notoriously patchwork, and this applies more strongly still to later Samhitas.

Much more important is the question of their antiquity. Oldenberg makes the Mahanāmnī verses an exception to his general view, that the Khilas are on the whole of later origin, and holds that they are coeval with the Rgveda, and were merely omitted because of some reason of ritual teaching from the ten Mandalas. Dr Schefstelowitz who disputes Oldenberg's general position, and accepts Hillebrandt's theory of the purer ritual tradition, assigns the verses (p 3) to the end of the Rgvedic period. Further, Oldenberg⁹ has suggested

⁶ He takes no notice of the new evidence in his review of Schefstelowitz *Göttingen Anz.*, 1907, p 227 for which and for other valuable papers I am indebted to his kindness.

⁷ Macdonell *Brhaddevala*, I, 147

⁸ Oldenberg, *Prolegomena*, pp 495, 501, 502

⁹ *S.B.E.*, XXX, 156.

that the verses are alluded to as the Śakvan verses in Rgveda, VII, 33, 4, X 71, 11, and this suggestion is at least plausible. They are apparently referred to as Mahanāmās in the Atharvaveda and Yajurveda (see below). It is borne out to some extent at least by the character of the language, which shows the rare forms *ānulanmīśah* *stute* *ide* *ide*, *rījase*, and *samnyase*. The metre is also of an archaic type in so far as resolutions are frequently necessary to restore it. The Khala Anśhrāmī gives the following note: *vidā dāśa padaś ca pañca Visvomitra Indra 1a Prajāpati Andram pūnam anustubham purisapadany Agneyaśmānandrapaurṇadāyini tairajam dāśyapañcamyaśv amīhan calurthi mankutarini sapṭami purastidbrāhmi natamyanthe pañkū*. As a matter of fact as both Weber* and Oldenberg recognize, the verses are not preserved in their primitive form but only as modified to suit their supposed sacred character. In verses 2, 5, and 8, which were apparently originally *anustubh*, the fourth *pada* has been omitted for the insertion of a sort of refrain. Verses 1, 3 and 6 are in *anustubh*. Verse 4 appears to be 8+12+8+8, verse 7, 12+8+8+8, verse 9, 8+8+8+8+8. The rest is in no regular metre. Oldenberg (p 33) considers that originally the metre consisted of seven and five sets of eight syllables respectively but this seems hardly borne out by the facts. It should be noted that the Khala text manufactures the last four of the nine *purisapadani* into one verse () and in this respect is certainly not old for the *purisapadani* cannot reasonably be held to have ever made up a verse. They are referred to, however as five in the Kauṣṭhika Brahmana XXIII 2, and connected with Prajāpati Agni, Indra Pūṣan and Devah, and in the Bṛhaddevata VIII, 102, they are connected with the same deities save that Viṣṇu is substituted for the Devāh (so the A version, the II vers on omits Prajāpati, while Mītra text includes both Prajāpati and the Devāh see Macdonell's note). They are also mentioned in the Pañcavimsa Brahmanā XIII 4 12, where elaborate directions are given as to their selection to make up the *śuk ara saman* Lātyajana Sutra, IV, 10 18 Śāṅkhayana Śrauta Sutra V, 6 13, &c and in the Aitareya Brāhmana, IV, 4, V, 7, VI, 24, Atharvaveda XI 7, 6, Vajrasaneyi Samhitā, XXIII, 36 Kathaka Samhitā, X 10, Taittiriya Samhitā, V, 2, 22 1*.

The verses contain several phrases reminiscent of the Rgveda perhaps borrowed from earlier hymns, at least they tend to convey an impression of second hand use. *jetaram aparajitam* = RV I, 11, 2, *sā mah parśad ah* = RV, X 187, 1, *Indram dhanasya sakhye* is the last *pada* of RV VIII, 3 5^d (thus I owe to Bloom

* Ind. Stud. XII 68.

* For the last four refs I am indebted to Bloomfield *Indic Concordance* p 696* who gives other passages, cf also Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XXII, 358, Eggeling *S B E*, XLI, xx, XLIV, 330 n 2.

field, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 210^b); *sam anyāu bravavahai*=RV, I, 30, 6, *sakhā sūśro adityah*=RV, I, 187, 3¹, *śavisiha vajrinn rājase*=RV., I, 80, 1^a (with *gata*) These last two cases seem to me strongly in favour of the later date of these verses, for *bravavahai* is not unnatural in RV, I, 30, 6 where it seems to refer to Indra and the speaker who are to agree in other battles, the previous half verse referring to a conflict, but it is distinctly awkward here where the first half verse has no reference to a fight or other occasion of association. This only, however, proves that the *Mahānāmni* verses are not among the earliest parts of the Rgveda.

The last four *pūrtapādāni* are made out of the preceding verses, *evā hi śakrō*, from v. 2, *vai hi śakrō*, from v. 3, *vaśāś dnu*, from v. 4. The Āśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 2, 9, shows that other *pādas* of the verses were used independently in the ritual, *pracetana pracetayayāhi pāda matsva i kratuś chanda riam brhat sumna a dhehi no vasan ity anustup* : Ibid., 12, has. *ud yad bradhnyā v utapam it paridhanyā i eva hy evaiva hmdra i evā hi śakra vai hi śakra it japitā i apāh pūrtasam haritāś sūnam it jāyot i* and again the *pūrtapādāni* in VI, 3, 26.

For the question of the 'authorship' of this Āraṇyaka by Āśvalayana, cf. *Introd.*, pp. 18 sq. For the view that this forms a sort of Āśvalayana Samhita may be compared the fact that there is an Āpastambya Mantrapāṭha, a collection of Grhya verses and formulae, to accompany the Āpastamba Grhya Sūtra. So too, as Oldenberg (*S B E.*, XXX, 3-11) has conclusively shown, the Mantra Brahmana was prepared to accompany Gobhila's Grhya Sūtra, though it is not apparently ascribed to Gobhila, just as IV is not attributed to Āśvalayana in the Āraṇyaka itself. Winternitz (*Gesch der indisch Lit.*, I, 232) merely repeats Max Müller (*Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 314 sq., 339).

O generous one, show^a us a path, proclaim the regions, guide us, lord of many might, wealthy one || 1 ||

With these aids of thine, wise one, make us wise, for glory and for strength, Indra. For thine is strength || 2 ||

For wealth, for might, thunderer, most powerful, bearer of the bolt, thou

^a I do not consider Winternitz (*Mantrapāṭha*, I, xxxi sq.) to have refuted Oldenberg.

¹ *evāś* is rendered *etāu* by Sayana, and S takes it as a Vedic form of *vai*, i.e. imper of the aor. of *√iad* (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 851). Possibly this is correct (cf. *vai* in *ver* 5), and it is from *√iad* in the sense 'find', for which see the examples in Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, pp. 866^b, 867^a. But it may perhaps be really *evāś* the subj. of the aor. of *√iad* (Whitney, § 849) as an injunctive from *vi + √ad*. The accent would then, however, probably have been *evāś*, but exceptions are not unknown. The same question arises in RV, I, 40, 3 *evāś sakhāśau śak*. For the accent, *pūrtanām*, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 319. For *loc.*, cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, pp. 58, 122, Fischel, *Vedische Studien*, II, 1, 2, Oldenberg, *Keligion des Veda*, p. 239, n. 6.

movest¹ Thou movest, most generous, bearer of the bolt : Come hither, drink, and be glad || 3 ||

Grant us wealth with good heroes Thou art² the lord of might according to thy will. Thou movest, most generous, bearer of the bolt, who art the most powerful of heroes || 4 ||

Most generous of givers, wise one, guide us aright Indra finds³ || Him I praise For he has will and strength || 5 ||

Him we summon to our aid, the conqueror, unconquered. May he convoy us⁴ beyond our foes He is strength, resolve, and mighty order || 6 ||

Indra we summon for the winning of wealth, the conqueror, unconquered May he convoy us beyond our foes : May he convoy us beyond our enemies⁵ || 7 ||

¹ *ṛajam* may be regarded as the second singular pres. indic. of a sixth class root *ṛaj*, as Whitney (*Sanskrit Grammar*, § 738 a) takes it here. The exact sense is doubtful. It may conceivably = 'thou art praised', but the sense 'move' is possible, if the root is akin to the Greek *ῥάγω*. Cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 181, Bartholomae, *Indog. Forsch.*, II, 281, Néluser, *Beiz Beitr.*, XV, 39, Oldenberg *S B E*, XLVI, 396, 436 ('press on, strive forward'), Fischei (*Indische Studien* I, 109), however, compares *ṛajay* with *ῥάγω*, and Geldner (*Ibid.*, III, 111 sq.) postulates a *√ṛj*-*lukt* *d* *stau* either transitive or intransitive. He does not, unhappily, quote or explain this passage. In RV, VIII, 9, 27 he renders *ṛajam* *ṛajati* as 'I desire to adorn thee', and possibly the form *ṛajati* might be an infim. = an imperative (cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 412, Heuser, *Beiz Beitr.*, XV, 39; Hopkins, *A J P*, XIII, 21 sq.; Speyer, *Indische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 216 d). The accentuation *ṛajā madra* seems most probable, cf. *ṛadmir* *ṣ* *ṛajati* *kṛti* *ṛajati* in RV, VII, 22, 9 and other examples given in Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 36 sq.; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 594 b; Speyer, *Indische und Sanskrit Syntax*, p. 80; Macdonell, *Indic Grammar*, p. 108. *madra* is irregularly accented, but there are many parallels, Whitney, § 618; Macdonell, p. 99 (foot).

² *dhawoḥ* is according to Whitney (*Sanskrit Grammar*, § 83 b, c, cf. Delbrück, l.c., p. 144) either an injunctive of an unaugmented *a* aorist or a subjunctive of the root aorist. But in sense it may be an indicative. *adhi* *am* may perhaps be 'according to our will'. *ṛajad* *ṛajam* is curious but the variant *ṛaj* is merely an easy correction. Cf. *ṛajad* *ṛajam*, RV, IV, 40, 4. The Taittiriya Samhita, III, 2, 9, 4 has *vidur* *ṛajatyam* *ṛajad* *ṛajam* *ṛajam* *ṛajam* *ṛajam* *ṛajam* *ṛajam*, where the conjunction of *ṛajad* and *ṛajam* is different, but where *vidur* supports the derivation of *ṛajad* from *√ṛj*. Cf. I, 2, 6, a 3.

³ *vid* must be 3rd sing. like *ite*, and may mean 'knows', cf. Hopkins *J A O S*, VI, 276, n. Sayana renders it as a 2nd sing. For *stare* see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 894 d, Delbrück, l.c., p. 181. If *stare* is read, the accent is somewhat irregular. But irregular accents in quasi subordinate clauses are numerous, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 495-598, Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 43. RV, I, 189, 3, III, 2, 2, with Oldenberg's notes (*S B E* XLVI, 181, 223) *Z D M G*, LX, 735 sq.

⁴ Sayana takes *at* *parid* as 'let him destroy', and the last *ṛajad* as meaning, 'the sacrifice, the metre used, the fruits of the offering, and all great'. The words are clearly not in place here, and make little sense.

⁵ *ṛidhāḥ* Sayana explains as those whom we should hate, although they do not hate. The meaning is perhaps 'beyond all failures', cf. *dit* *ṛidhāḥ* in this sense in RV, I, 36, 7; III, 9, 4, 10, 7.

BRĀHMYA V

ADHYĀYA I.

IN the Mahāvratā ceremony there are twenty-five verses to accompany the kindling of the fire¹. In the twenty-one² verses (used in the Viśvavrat) four are inserted before the second last, beginning, 'With fuel Agni' (RV., VIII, 44, 1). A bull is to be offered in Viśvavrat³ accompanied by muttering the verses. The Ājya and Prāṇa Śāstras are taken from the Viśvavrat⁴. The Śāstras of

¹ Sāyana explains that although the Śāndhenī verses are not part of the Soma sacrifice itself, yet they are used in the animal sacrifice which forms a part of it and so are in place here. He quotes Mīmamsā Sūtra, III, 1, 18, 9 *anarthakyaś cā tad aṅgata*. They are to be said after the anointing of the animal by the Adhvaryu, according to Āpastamba. Cf. also his Vajrasamhitā, 1 and 2 (S B E, XXX, 319, 345). For the gen., cf. Caland, *Altindisches Zeremoniell*, p. 18, n. 2, Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 1, 5, 4. III, 1, 1, 3.

² There are in the Darśapernamaseqi, see Hillebrandt, *Neu und Vollmondsopfer*, pp. 74 sq., fifteen verses beginning with RV, III, 17, 1 (cf. Oldenberg, S B E, XLVI, 199, Bergaigne, *Recherches sur l'histoire de la liturgie védique*, p. 19), see Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, III, 8, 2, 1. There are only eleven separate verses, but the first and last are each thrice repeated. In the Viśvavrat the fifteen are extended into twenty one by the interpolation of six verses beginning with RV, III, 17, 5. These are inserted before the second last verse, RV, V, 28, 5. Then four more verses, beginning with RV, VIII, 44, 1, are added before this verse to make up the twenty-five. The Śāṅkhayana here ignores these verses. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 14, gives the number as 17. See a list in Aśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra, I, 2, 7. The construction acc. for nom. is remarkable and is not a mark of late or careless style, for these irregularities and the use of numerals are found in the Mantras (e.g. *saṁśṭā rinam, śāṁśṭā pūrṣhā*, cited by Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 486 c) and in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 48, 9 *śaṁśṭā tam kṛcchraṁ aruḥ*, while in VII, 2, 7, *parṇataraḥ antaḥ śraṇa ca śāṁśṭā aṅgata* occurs (see Aufrecht, p. 418). Above, III, 2, 4, 3, 8, occurs *śāṁśṭā tam kṛcchraṁ* while Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 1 has *śāṁśṭā tam kṛcchraṁ* which examples all appear to be transfers of accusative for nominative, though the possibility of their being new stems is a cannot be denied (especially as the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa actually has *trayaśṭāṁśṭā*, a transfer to the *i* declension). Cf. Intro., p. 56. The idiom has hardly been adequately noticed in Dehnbach, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 82.

³ The Śāṅkhayana Brāhmya, I, 1, prescribes a bull for Indra and a goat for Prajapati. The Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 7, 7, mentions also a *śavanyā paṇu*, see Hillebrandt *Relig. Literatur*, pp. 125, 126. Cf. also Aśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra, XIII, 2, 17. *Upamā* means not silence but so as not to be overheard, see Sāyana's quotation, *Āpāstambā śāṁśṭā mānāḥ prapayam*, and Āpastamba Vajrasamhitā 9, 11 and 113 (S B E, XXX, 319 and 345), where the Śāndhenis are not *śāṁśṭā* but *antaḥ* (see note on 11).

⁴ For the Ājya see I, 1, 1. The Prāṇa consists of seven *brāṇa*, I, 1, 3-4, preceded by the *puruṣa*, *Prayer agree yaṁśṭāḥ*, etc., Śāṅkhayana Śrauta Sūtra, VII, 10, 9. The *puruṣa* are also given in Scheffelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rigveda*, as *khula*, V, 6.

the Hotrakas are taken from the Caturvimśa rite¹. In the morning pressing the Brāhmaṇīccāhmanin should add the verses, beginning, 'The busy moving ones' (RV, X, 153, 1) and at the midday pressing the verses, 'Of this strong youthful one drink' (RV, X, 160, 1)². The tristich which forms the strophe begins, 'The buffalo in the bowls, the barley-mixed' (RV, II, 22, 1), the tristich forming the antistrophe consists of the three verses, 'Indra, come hither to us from far away' (RV, I, 130, 1), 'For to Indra heaven, the wise one, bowed' (RV, X, 127, 1), and, 'To him a song excelling' (RV, X, 133, 1)³. The Marutvatya Śāstra is taken over from the Caturvimśa and extended by the hymns, 'Fair has been my effort, singer' (RV, X, 27, 1), 'Drink the Soma for which in anger thou breakest' (RV, VI, 17, 1), 'With what splendour' (RV, I, 165, 1), and, 'Indra, with the Maruts' (RV, III, 48, 1)⁴. The Marutvatya Śāstra ends with the hymn, 'Thou art born, terrible, for strength, for energy' (RV, X, 53, 1). At the end of the Marutvatya Śāstra, the Hotr, leaving his place by the incomplete route,⁵ offers three oblations in the Agnidh's fire with a ladle of *udumbāra* wood (accompanying them with the verses) —

¹ The Hotrakas are the Mātravaruna, Brāhmaṇīccāhmanin and Aśvika. In the Agnistoma their Śāstras begin with RV, III, 62, 16, VIII, 17, 1, III 12, 1, respectively. In the Caturvimśa they begin with RV, V, 68, 3, I, 4, 1, VIII, 72, 13, respectively.

² The Mahāvratā differs in these points even from the Caturvimśa. Sayana leaves it undecided whether the passages extend to five verses, or only to one verse by the *parikhāta*, *pram padagrāhane*, for which see Āśvalayana Śrouta Sūtra, I, 1, 17.

³ These verses are apparently to precede the Śāstra of the Brāhmaṇīccāhmanin at the midday pressing. The word *stāhya* is used because the verses correspond to those used in the Saman corresponding to the Śāstra, cf. Hillebrandt, *Ritual Literature*, p. 103. The Śaikhayana Śakha ignores the Śāstras of the Hotrakas. The reference to the midday pressing is out of order.

⁴ For the Marutvatya Śāstra of the Hotr at the midday pressing, see I, 2, 1 and 2. In the Agnistoma it begins with RV, VIII, 68, 1-3, and VIII, 2, 1-3. The Caturvimśa contains alterations, and the Mahāvratā adds the hymns enumerated. *Alana* (found in VS, TS, &c.) must mean *satara* as Sayana has it here. Cf. *Antareya Brāhmaṇa*, V, 4, 12, where Sayana renders *satara* as *satara*. Friedlander, on Śaikhayana Aranyaka, I, 3, suggests the sense 'scheme' for it. In RV, II, 1, 10, *atīśa* = 'expander', cf. my *Śaikhayana Aranyaka*, p. 3, p. 6.

⁵ Sayana here (cf. Ānartya on Śaikhayana Śrouta Sūtra, VI, 13, 7. VII, 7, 4, Āśvalayana Śrouta Sūtra, V, 19, 8, VI, 5, 1, and comm.) explains that the *samsthānamāra* is when, after the completion of the pressing, the Hotr departs from the *sahas* by the west, the *visamsthāna* is when, before the pressing is finished, he leaves by the eastern side. The Śaikhayana Śrouta Sūtra XVII, 12 gives eight oblations on the *agnadhīya* instead of three there and ten in the *margalya*. The Mantras are quite different. See XVII, 11, 1-4. The first is a long prose Mantra, the second is the seventh *madh* Mantra, and the eighth consists of a couple of verses, the first is *samsthāna*, the second a *gayatri* in strongly marked iambic metre of an archaic type, neither of which verses has, according to Bloomfield's *Vedic Canon*, any parallel. After reciting the verses, he puts down the ladle *yathayatanam*, departs by the way he came, and in front of the *sahas* to the north of the *prati*, facing the

'Indra, Bhṛhaspati, Soma, and the goddess, Vac, have aided me'¹⁰ May Mitra and Varuna, Heaven and Earth, and me when first I call || 1 ||

'May the Ādityas, the all gods, and the seven anointed Kings,'¹¹ Vayu, Pāśan, Varuna, Soma, Agni, Sūrya, with the constellations, may they help me || 2 ||

'May the fathers protect me, and || this universe, and the children of Prṣni, the Maruts, with their splendour, ye who have Agni as your tongue and are worthy of sacrifice, may ye gods, hearing our cry, protect us || 3 ||'

He offers ten oblations on the *margajya* altar¹² to the south, the last of which he first divides into four and deposits to the north of the fire. In the middle of the day, after the carrying forth of the fire, the *margajya* fire is made

east, he mutters the *parṇamadāḥ yajñāḥ, vac ayur viśvayur viśvān ayur ahy eva ādityepekṣi viśvatha یدو maghavon یدو ایت* (cf. above, p. 263) after which he adores the several members of the fire altar conceived in human form (XVII, 12, 6-13 6). For the Parṇamads themselves, cf. my *Saṅkhyāyana Āranyaka*, p. 4, Eggeling *S B E*, XLII, 288, n. 2, and for the meaning of *āmad*, Lanman in Whitney's *Translation of Atharvaveda*, p. 158. The Hotṛ goes north to the Agnadh's fire (For Agnadh, cf. Oldenberg, *S B E*, XLII, 189, and Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 18 n. 6).

¹⁰ Or 'may they aid me', as Sayana takes it. He thinks *parṇamadam* is an epithet of *Dyauprithās* or *Mitruvaruṇas*.

¹¹ Sayana explains this by the list in Taittiriya Āranyaka I, 7, *arṇo bhṛhaspāḥ pātaraḥ pātaraḥ 1 svarṇaḥ jyotiṣman 1 bhṛgūḥ 1 te arṇas sarvā devān atāpanti* | This may be right, otherwise one might expect || to mean till seven Ādityas. No doubt the seven Ādityas set the model || in the later theory of seven suas, whose names are variously given (cf. seven Ṛsis, seven Hotṛs, seven sounds &c., Oldenberg, *S B E*, XLII, 125), see Visnu Purana, VI, 2, Hopkins, *Great Epics of India* p. 475. Rajadralala reads in the text *mā nu*, which is certainly wrongly accented and seems not quite as likely as *manu* in view of the *anu* elsewhere used. The Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, II, 5, 8, 2 has *anu tvendro madaty anu Bhṛhaspātāḥ | anu Sōmo anu Agnir av* | | *anu tva viśvā devā atāntu | anu saptaḥ rājano yā utōkṣitvāḥ | anu teḍ Mitrāvidrumaḥ śhṛtātām | anu dyauprithās vāvalamān | sūryo dīkṣhīr anu tvatātū | can dīdima nḍhātātū anu t'atātū* | Note the different reading *utō abhikṣitāḥ*. The text appears from Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 973^a, to occur in *hāṭhaka Samhita*, XLVII, 9 d, which has (9 c) *śūryo 'hōhīr anu tvatātū*, confirm of *manu* against Mitra's *ma nu* (which is followed in the *Concordance*, p. 1028^b), and (9 b) *anu Somo anu Agner av*, and (9 a) *anu tvendro madaty anu Bhṛhaspātāḥ*, thus presenting only one line as against the two lines of the Āranyaka and the Brāhmaṇa. In the next verse *yē agnīyitū uḍ va yajātāḥ* is a tag found in RV, VI, 52, 13 c, and in the other Samhitas (Bloomfield, p. 795^b), the other three *paśas* seem as yet unparalleled. The series of prose Mantras below is also (see Index II) unique.

¹² In the middle of the *sadas* and the *hazardhās* there is a space from north to south. The *agnidhīrya* altar is at the north, the *margajya* at the south. With *catargrāhitaḥ, aḥyam* must be understood see Āpastamba, Yajñopaniṣad 195 (*S B E*, LXX 341) cf. *catargrāhitaḥ yajñāḥ*, Taittiriya Āranyaka, I, 2, *catargrāḥ Yā tva aḥyahātāḥ*, Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 20, 2, "gkṣitām. || 21, but the construction is very awkward. Throughout the terms *dakṣas* and *uttara* are ambiguous. For the *sadas* the priests' tent, cf. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, III, 5 3 5, and Eggeling's note.

to kindle.¹³ (The offering is made in n) when it is covered up, and either to the east, the north, or the north-east side. (The verses used are as follows):—

‘May I become unassailable like fire; may I become firmly rooted like the earth || 1 ||

‘May I become unapproachable¹⁴ like the sky; may I become unassailable like the heaven || 2 ||

‘May I become without a superior like the sun; may I become renewed like the moon || 3 ||

‘May I become renewed like mind; may I be multiplied like the wind¹⁵ || 4 ||

‘May I become one’s own like the day¹⁶; and dear like night || 5 ||

‘May I become born again like kine; may I become glorious¹⁷ like a pair || 6 ||

‘Mine be the flavour of water and the form of plants || 7 ||

‘May I become widespreading¹⁸ like food, and lordly like the sacrifice || 8 ||

‘May I become like the Brahman in the world, and like the Kṣatriya for prosperity || 9 ||

‘When, O Agni, this assembly is gathered (RV., X, 11, 8)¹⁹ || 10 ||’

¹³ The idea seems to be that the fire is kept in from the time it is lighted on the *andryditya* altar but is now ‘wakened’ *frāherts* in this use is first found in the Śeṣota Sūtras, Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 112.

¹⁴ The attraction of *anasyam* is curious, but is paralleled in RV., I, 65, 5: *paṣṭir nā ramā d hūir nā pṛthivī gīrī nā bhūma* (Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 56), and below, *mana vṇṇurvam*, *annam ita vidāt*, *govā ita pumarābhavaḥ*, and in the case of the verb, RV., V, 15, 8: *dyumanto arāyo graṇoveryaṇe bhāt*, Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 417. Cf. also Taittiriya Aranyaka, VIII, 6; Weber, *Jud. Stud.*, II, 222, n. For a series of words with *bhāyasam*, cf. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 20 and 21.

¹⁵ *yathā mana uttarottaram abhiorādhikantāyā prayatamenam tat tatatphalaprāptiā nānam rṣipau pratigadyāt . . . yathā vayer asādhodimūḥ samutratirudideśe tāt nājam uttarottarabhiorādhīyā sangharūpo bhavāt* (Sāyana).

¹⁶ Sāyana renders *svāḥ* as wealth. The day gives wealth by permitting mercantile operations. Emendation to *svāḥ* is easy but improbable. Cf. the curious *svāḥ* in RV., I, 77, 5 (Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 88), *yakṣam ita*, Gobhila Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 4, 28. Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, III, 140. Night gives rest to the weary (Sāyana), note *prayo not priyā*.

¹⁷ This must be the sense though the expression *marīṣayāḥ*, ‘glories,’ is curious. Kine have offspring yearly, and pairs (e.g. Umā and Mahādeva, Lakṣmī and Nārāyaṇa) are glorious (Sāyana).

¹⁸ The reading *vidāt* is certain, but both Rājendralīla and the Ānandāśrama edition read in the commentary *vīdāt*, and Sāyana may have so read, but this is not necessary. For a converse case, cf. V, 2, 2, when Rājendralīla reads *svām* for *svām*. The next Mantra offers considerable difficulty. Sāyana renders as the Brahman in the world and *kratram rājyaḥ gajātādīryam adhipatē*, apparently taking *īryam* as a genitive (cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, II 349, 351). But the parallelism of the sentence calls urgently for a locative which gives far sense, ‘in point of wealth.’ The speaker desires (a) renown, (b) wealth. Only the exact force of the locative varies in the two cases.

¹⁹ The last oblation is accompanied by a RV. verse

(In this stanza) the three words *atra*, *vibhajisha*, and *vītha* are not in accordance with the Rgveda text⁸⁰

Standing there he worships the sun,⁸¹ turning so as to keep his right side towards ॥ as it turns, with these verses, omitting the cries of *śūkha*,⁸² and with the verse, 'Come hither, this is sweet, this is sweet. Drink this butter draught. This is sweet, this is sweet.' He then instructs the maidservants,⁸³ who carry full pailers, six in front, three behind, (saying), 'Walk three times from left to right round this altar and this pail of water, smearing your right thighs with your right hands, and saying, "Come hither, this is sweet, this is sweet"'

⁸⁰ This must mean that in the rite the RV verse is to be altered by reading in *śūkha* 3 *ratna* *atra vibhajisha svadhāpā* for *ratna* as *yad vibhajī*, and in *śūkha* 4, *bhāgim* as *atra ratnamantam vītha* for *vīthā*. Śāyana adds that these alterations are improper, just as the alteration *vīdhā* for *vydhā* in *Āyazpār* as *haviṣā vīdhā*, Taittirīya Saṃhitā, I, 2, 2, VI, 2, 3, Maitrīyaṇi Saṃhitā, I, 2, 2, III, 6, 4. The *vī* is not in Bloomfield. But this is not implied in the Āranyaka. The verse occurs in Atharvaveda, XVIII, 1, 26, and Maitrīyaṇi Saṃhitā, IV, 14, 15, but in neither place so altered. Bloomfield (*Vedic Concordance*, pp. 43^b, 749^b) also can merely quote Śāyana's view: Perhaps the Bṛhadāraṇyaka is meant. A different case occurs in IV *Indram dhdānya vīdhā haviṣā* when *haviṣā* is added (as in Mahā Brāhmana Upaniṣad 7, cited by Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 210^d) to the first three words which are found in RV, VIII 3 5 d. But the Mahānārāyaṇa verses are not part of the RV and their occurrence is not parallel to this remarkable case.

⁸¹ This is done later in the Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka I, 5, where the words are almost identical, *atrasa vīthāna adityam upastishāte*. The Mantra is quite different, see Śrauta Sūtra, XI II, 13, 9, 10. For the following see my *Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka*, pp. 26 sq.

⁸² The offerings are accompanied as usual by the cry *śūkha*. These are omitted. For the rule, cf. Apastamba Yaṅyapariśiṣṭa 87 (S B E, XXX, 339).

⁸³ Cf. Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XI II 14 where apparently deliberately the direction is from right to left (*apradakṣiṇa* *am*), though the words said are alike, *haṁ madhu śānta madhu*. The dance is clearly a tale and vegetation spell, cf. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States* III, 103. These and the other ceremonies are all mentioned in the other parallel passages, Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 10, 12, IV, 1-3, Tāndya Brāhmaṇa, V, 5, 6. Kaṣhaka, XXXIV, 5, Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, VIII, 3, Taittirīya Saṃhitā VII, 5, 9 and 10, Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 6, 7. These versions differ in many details, the most important rite which is mentioned in neither of the Rgvedic works is the struggle of an Ārya and a Śūdra for a round skin, which represents the sun (cf. Oldenberg, *Religion der Veda*, pp. 444, 506, Usener, *Archiv f. Religionswissenschaft*, 1904 pp. 297 sq.). It is noteworthy that in Lāṭyāyana, IV 2, 18, where the words repeated are like those in Śāṅkhāyana the form *vataryak* also occurs. So Dṛaḥyayana Taittirīya Saṃhitā, VII 5, 10, has *guyantaryak*. The direction there is also *pradakṣiṇam*. After the eight *ajya* libations in the *agnidhriya* fire, according to the Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, I 4, come the *parimand*. They are twenty five in number and are followed by seven *stotriyas* named *adityasa samana*, *bhūtechadum samana*, *krishṇa anukṛta*, *payas*, *arish*, and *arkishapṛa*. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 2, 2, 8, 9 contains a somewhat parallel version, see Eggeberg, S B E XLII, 288, n 2, and thus again (cf. Introduct., p. 36) agrees with the Śāṅkhāyana against the Aitareya. These *samana* are called *devachandana*, Śāṅkhāyana I, 5 and are followed by *yajus*. Then comes an adoration of the members of the fire (see here V, 1, 2), and of the sun, and the Hotr declares that the 'great one has united with the great

2. 'When the singing of the *stotra* has been requested, then do ye cast down the water in three places, on the northern altar, on the *mārjālīya* altar, and the rest within the enclosure' ¹ Having gone away so as to keep the *mārjālīya* fire on his right, ² he stands before the sacrificial post in front of the fire, with face to the west, and worships the head of the fire with the words, 'Honour to the Gāyatra which is thy head;' then, returning by the way he came, ³ with face to the north, he worships the right side of the fire with the words, 'Honour to the Rathantara which is thy right side.' Then passing to the west of the tail of the fire, ⁴ with face to the east, he worships the left side of the fire with the words, 'Honour to the Bṛhat which is thy left side.' Then on the west ⁵

one, ¹ I = Agni with Tṛiśatī, 'the god with the goddess,' i.e. Vāyu with Antarikṣa, 'Brahman (nest,) with Brāhmanī' (see Introd., p. 68, n. 1), i.e. Āditya with Dyauṣ. On this follows (1, 6) a Vāisāmitra legend (cf. Atareya, II, 2, 3) to explain these identifications. For the use of *apsa* + *śrīd*, cf. the famous passage in the Mahābhārata, I, 3, 25 (Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 480, 481), where an ape *upatisthāti* to warm himself, but a man *upatisthate* in reverence.

² For *antarvedi*, cf. Atareya Brāhmana, VII, 33, 1; *antahparidhī*, Bṛhaddevatā, VII, 98; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 312. This belongs of course to the end of the preceding Khanda, and it is difficult to see why it has been separated in Śāyana's text. *altars mārjālīya* means the *agnidārīya* fire, which was used for the same purpose.

³ This describes the worship of the fire altar in its simplest bird shape, head, two wings, tail, and body. In Śākhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 13, the *śamans* and the order differ, being (1) *pūrvārtha* with Gāyatra, (2) right side with Rathantara, (3) left side with Bṛhat, (4) *madhya* with Vāmadevya, (5) tail with Vajñesajālīya. Cf. Śatapatha Brāhmana, IX, 1, 2, 35 and 39, X, 1, 2, 8, and Eggeling's summary (based on this passage and Śākhāyana), *S. B. E.*, XLIII, 283, n. Latyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 11, 5, where as here the body is placed last, but which agrees as to the *śamans* with Śākhāyana and also with Dīkhyāyana, and in which the sprinkling of water in three parts also occurs. The *Śamans* referred to will be found as follows, *gṛyātram* in *trayī stoma*, Sāmaveda, II, 146-148, 263-265, 800-803 (or II, 8, 4, see *S. B. E.*, XLIII, 178), *rathantara* in *pañcadaka stoma*, ibid., II, 30, 31, *brhat* in *ṣṇīpāṇī stoma* ibid., II, 159-160, *vajñesajālīya* in *pañcatamīka stoma*, ibid., II, 833-835, *śhakra* in *śhaktamīka stoma*, ibid., II, 460-462. For the *Śamans* of II, 3, 4. For a drawing of the *agnidārīya* see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 235.

⁴ He had gone from the *mārjālīya* in the south to the east side of the *tridygni* and he now returns to the south. *Rathantara* is unusual, but it is supported by all the MSS. Latyāyana and Śākhāyana have *rathantṛaya*.

⁵ It is not clear why he should not go round to the north, but all that is done is to go to the end of the west or tail side, when looking east, along the left side, he utters the Mantra.

⁶ *palati* may simply mean 'next', or, as Śāyana takes it, refer to the place where the Hotṛ stands. Apparently the difference between this and his former position is that he stands directly behind the tail, instead of going past it. This account of his movements corresponds on the whole with that of the ceremony of the Śatarodīya, which has analogies in the Mahāvratā (Śatapatha Brāhmana, IX, 1, 2, 44). In it, according to the Śatapatha, IX, 1, 2, 35 sq., the *Śamans*, (1) *gṛyātram*, (2) *rathantṛaya*, (3) *brhat*, (4) *vāmadevya*, (5) *vajñesajālīya*, and (6) *pūrvārthārāya*, correspond to (1) head, (2) right wing, (3) left wing, (4) body, (5) tail, (6) breast; according to Latyāyana, I, 5, 11, which very closely follows the order of

of the fire, with face to the east, he worships the tail with the words, 'Honour to the Bhadrā which is thy tail and thy support.' Then on the south of the tail he worships the body with the words, 'Honour to the Rājana which is thy body.'

3. He returns to the seat as he went¹. The swing has already been made ready.² Having cleansed the two posts, the ropes, and the cross beam, and having taken them by the road called *firika*,³ having gone round the left the Agnadh's altar,⁴ (having brought them within) the seat by the east door (he places the implements⁵) to the left of all the altars. The planks of the swing are made of *udumbara* or of *palāśa*, or of both. There should be three planks worked on both sides, or two, and a like number of sharp-pointed sticks. The

movements in this Aitareya passage, the (1) *gayatram*, (2) *rathantarām*, (3) *brāhat*, (4) *yajña-yajñīyam*, (5) *Vamadevya*, and (6) *Prājāpatihrdya*, correspond to (1) head, (2) right side, (3) left side, (4) tail, (5) right arm pit, and (6) left arm pit. Cf. also the elaborate ceremonial of the *parimadaś* at the Mahāvratā as described in Śatapatha, X, 1, 2, 9, Śākhāyana Āranyaka, II, 4 (with Friedländer's note p. 37), and the similar use after the beginning of the *prsthā śloka* of the *parimadaś* (*prana*, *apana*, *avatapaksu*, *Prājāpater hr̥dya*, *Vasisthaḥya nīlata*, *sattvīyārāḥi*, *lōka* and *anulōka*, *yama*, *ayur*, *navastakha*, *ryasya samān*) in the worship of the parts of the altar in Tandyā Brāhmaṇa, V, 4, 1-13. Latyayana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 9, 1 sq. Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, 1, 2, 6 5. In the Mahāvratā Saman the parts of the bird are head, right wing, left wing, tail, and trunk only (Eggeling *S B E*, XLIII, xxvii). The whole conception is clearly borrowed (cf. *Introd.*, p. 50) from the altar in the Agnicayana which gave origin to the mystic doctrines of the Ādhvaryus (see especially Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VI-8), and of which the Mahāvratā is an adaptation by the Hoṭṛs. In Yajñameyī Sampluta, XII, 4, the *trīṣṭi* is the head, the *gayatram* the eyes, *brāhat* and *rathantarām* the wings, the hymn the soul, the *yajum* the name, the metres the limbs, the *Vamadevya* the body, the *yajñayajñīyam* the tail. For the relation of *saman* and words, cf. Oldenberg, *Z D A G*, XXXVIII, 439 sqq., 464 sq., *Winternitz, Gesch. der indisch. Lit.*, I, 143 sq., and see Eggeling *S B E*, XLIII, 180, n. 2, Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 276 sq. The *Vamadevya* is based on Samaveda, II, 32, 33, the Yajñayajñīya on Samaveda, II, 33.

¹ He comes back to the seat near the *moryajña* fire, which he left to worship the *cūya* altar. The expression occurs several times in the Śrauta Sūtra. For the eight altars see Eggeling, *S B E*, XXVI, 148, n. 4 and the plan on p. 475, followed by Caland and Henry, *L'Agnostoma*, Hillebrandt *Nieuw und Veldmanhopfer*, p. 191.

² By the Ādhvaryu. Cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 32.

³ This is the name of the passage between the *uthara* and *catoṣṭa*, Śākhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, V, 15, 2, &c., *Matrayanī Sampluta*, III, 8, 10. The action is rendered intelligible by a glance at the plan in Eggeling.

⁴ The *par* of *parivrajya* must refer to circumambulation. The meaning of the phrase is probably given by Śākhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 11, 4 *parvaja devaḥ agniḥ itram prapa dyotitarenāgni dhīryam dhīryam parvaja*, though the *parvaja* *deva* here is otherwise explained. The idea is, he goes round the altar from right to left, probably. Cf. also *ibid.*, V, 14. The sentence is so elliptical as to be unintelligible without Sayana's *parvaja*. Śākhāyana, XVII, 7, 11, is much more simple.

⁵ The verb must be gathered from *atyadodāśa* below, strictly speaking the next sentences are parenthetical and this sentence is continuous with *dakṣiṇottare āhūne nūbhīya*.

swing should be a yard in size from east to west, its cross breadth should be a yard less a hand, the points of its (planks) should be to the north, and they should be fastened together by sticks with their points east. Having inserted the posts in the earth to the north and south, around the seat of the Hotr, he spreads the cross beam over them so that it is on a level with the worker's face.¹ Holes are (bored) in the corners of the planks of the swing. He fastens the planks above by means of the ropes, the right one on the south, the left on the north.² The ropes should be of *darbha* grass, and with three strands,³ one rope to

¹ In the Śaṅkhayana Śrauta Sutra, XVII, 10, 7 and 8, the height is measured by the head of the Hotr, or if he is small his outstretched arms. Ibid., 4, 6, shows that both the planks and the cross beam have the points north. For the construction with *kartuk* dependent on *ayā*, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 2316. Speyer (*Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 113) gives many classical examples. For *abhitā* with accus., cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 183. It is found in Mantra, but more often in Brāhmaṇa. Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 88. For *uttarena* with accus., cf. Gaedicke, *Der Accusativ in Veda*, pp. 207 ff., see Laebich, *Deus Beir*, XI, 184. Delbrück and Gaedicke seem right in explaining the use as derived from the accus. with *anāḍ* and *antarā*. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 273, offers no explanation. In V, 2, 1, we find *uttarato 'guck*, in V, 1, 2, *dakṣiṇataḥ guchayata* with the more natural adnominal genitive. But in V, 1, 2, *aparṇa* has the accus. In Śaṅkhayana Āraṇyaka, VII, 3, *antarṇa* has the gen., in the Sutra, the acc. The measures are dubious, see Hopkins, *J A O S*, LXIII, 243.

² The Śaṅkhayana Śrauta Sutra, XVII, 10, 14, 15, explains that the right rope is tied to the north of the south post, the left to the south of the north post, i.e. inside the posts, just as in a modern swing. The point of view is of course facing east, with the south on the right and north on the left.

³ The use of *triṅṇa* and *dvyaṅṇa* with different senses of *ṅṇa* is awkward, but appears clearly so meant. Sayana points out that the rope as doubled would be $1\frac{1}{2}$ fathoms in length of which only a yard would be used by the rope passing under the plank (above *śūmatraḥ* from *śrūmatraḥ*). There would thus be plenty of rope available for the tying, as the top was only a man's height or less. Sayana takes *śaṃpāḍakṛṇa* as 'inclining to the left and right', i.e. the ropes should not go straight up. The only obscure point in this description of the tying on of the seat of the swing to the cross beam is *pradaksinaṃ* since it is not at first sight obvious how this applies to the act of fastening ropes. It apparently must mean that after the rope has been passed under the seat of the swing the one end is rolled round the cross beam slanting to the right, the other (on the opposite side, of course) also slanting to the right and the ends then are tied across. Provided there was sufficient friction to keep the ropes from slipping this would seem to give a substantial knot (cf. *nistarkya*). If this is so, we cannot accept Sayana's theory of *śaṃpāḍakṛṇa* and must fall back either on the view that the word means merely left (hand) rope and right (hand) rope, or take the epithet

* It is very unlikely that both ends of the rope should have been brought to the same side of the cross beam. In that case *pradaksinaṃ* would be rather less than more in point. Speyer (*Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 106, n.) points out that adjective *dvandva* are not unknown even in Sanskrit (cf. his *Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 208), and (p. 32, n. 1) argues from Minil, VI, 2, 38 when *ekadśa* is given as a *dvandva* that the grammarians recognized such types. He (§ 107) gives classical examples of distributive *dvandva*.

the left, one to the right, and five fathoms long, and should be folded double. Then folding (each end) thence (to the right) round the cross beam he makes a knot on the top, which can only be untied by twisting. They support the posts so as to be steady by means of branches and brushwood.¹ The swing should be four fingers or a hand distant from the ground.² On the right it may be somewhat higher or level. It should be a foot from the altar.

4 When¹ the swing has been put in position, the Hotr taking a lute of *udumbara* wood, with a hundred strings, in both hands, strikes it,² beginning from the lower side, as one does an ordinary lute³. The different notes of the lute he should produce in turn by the seven metres,⁴ each with four (syllables)

as applying to each rope and as meaning, 'with strands coiled from left to right.' Cf. perhaps the equally obscure passage, Āpastamba Śrautasamhitā, 60, 61 (S B E, XXX, 331, where Max Müller says, 'The exact process here intended is not quite clear. The ropes seem to have been made of vegetable fibres. See Katy, I 3, 15-17'). If *svayadaktina* = left and right, cf. for the use of the *drum*, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, 1, 160, who cites Atharvaveda, XII, 1, 28 *padbhāṣaṁ dakṣiṇāsvyādhāṣam*, Taittirya Brāhmaṇa, I, 5, 10, 1 *svārṇavāyādhāṣam kṣudbhāṣam*. The different order of words, *svayadaktina*, is in accordance with the usual rule as to number of syllables determining the order of the members of their compounds, Wackernagel, II, 1 166.

¹ Sayana explains that they fill up the holes in which are placed the feet of the posts with dirt, which is not thrown in by hand but by branches and *grass*. This, however, is quite unnecessary. Brushwood would be a much better material for strengthening the hold of a post. He defines *grass* as *śrīvāṇāṁśīpatrasenudalodibhāṁ nirvātī alpakotavilesaḥ*. The swing was obviously shaped like this [V]

² The distance according to Śaṅkhayana should be a *pradala*, XI II 20 12. Ibid, XVII, 1, discusses the planks, 2, the ropes and *osamti* 3, the lute, 4, the drums, 5, 6, 7, the other accessories and the preliminary steps, in great order and detail. Cf. Lājyana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 12.

³ There are similar passages in the Taittirya Brāhmaṇa, V, 5, 4 sq., and Lājyana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 12, 8, IV, 1, besides in the Śaṅkhayana Śrauta Sūtra, XII, 3, 11, 10 sq. Sayana points out that the Hotr is now seated to the west of the swing. The exact words as to the lute do not occur in Śaṅkhayana, but it is elaborately described, XII, 3.

⁴ Sayana renders merely, 'he should hold it on his left side like a lute'. But the idea is perhaps rather that he strikes one string after another, ascending in the scale, beginning from below and ascending, *uttarataḥ*, cf. *udhāṁ* below and Agnisvama on Lājyana Śrauta Sūtra, IV, 1, 4.

⁵ So Sayana on RV, I, 85, 10, where he similarly explains the phrase *viṇam dhanantak* used of the Maruts, cf. III 2, 5, n 1. Benfey (*Sammaveda, Glossar*, p 169) takes *viṇam* there as flute, and Zimmer (*Altindisches Leben*, p 139) follows him. Max Müller (*Marut Hymns*, pp 120, 121) preferred to see in it merely 'voice'. For *uduhams*, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 92, who considers it here an ablaut of *u*. Panini restricts its use to Ātmanepada, but Lājyana allows Parasmaipada with a prefix as here (Lachich, *Pīṇini*, p 84).

⁶ i.e. he plays notes corresponding to verses composed in these metres. The four more are, Sayana says *svay*, *dispadī*, *atichandak*, and *chando'ntaram*. If this last be omitted ten are got. But despite its use elsewhere, e.g., Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X 2, 2, 8, it must surely

over, or with ten (He should say) 'I produce thee with the *gayatri* metre I produce thee with the *anustubh* metre I produce thee with the *usubh* metre I produce thee with the *brhasti* metre I produce thee with the *pankti* metre. I produce thee with the *tristubh* metre I produce thee with the *jagati* metre. I produce thee with the *viraj* metre I produce thee with the *dvipada* metre I produce thee with the *atichandas* metre' Having gone through the metres according to the series of notes, he strikes the lute thrice, beginning from the foot with a branch of *udumbara* wood, fresh and still leafy, using the foot of it, (to the words) 'For up breathing I strike thee, for down-breathing I strike thee, for cross breathing I strike thee' But he should not say, 'I strike thee,' for other desires'. Then he hands over to the Saman singers the lute with the branch'. He places his two hands on the back plank (with the words), 'For creatures thee (I touch),' and pushes the swing to the east (with the words), 'Swing forward like the breath,' crosswise⁷ (with the words), 'Swing crosswise for cross-breathing,' and back to himself (with the words) 'Swing like back breathing' He repeats the words *bhukh*, *bhuvah*, and *svah*⁸ He then pushes the swing to the east' (with the words), 'For breath I push thee,' crosswise (with the words), 'For cross breathing I push thee,' and back to himself (with the words), 'For down-breathing I push thee' (With the words) 'May the Vasus mount thee with the *gayatri* metre, I mount after them,' he places his elbows on the back plank'. Then he should touch the front plank with his

mean each metre has four more syllables than its predecessor, viz 24, 28, 32, &c., and as Sayana takes it on Aitareya Brahmana, VIII, 6, 6

⁷ No doubt, as Sayana says a reference to a practice of other Śākhās, but not to the Śāṅkhayana Aranyaka or Śrauta Sūtra. For the words *audumbariya*, &c., cf. *audumbariyardraya jātāya sapalāyā* in Aitareya Brahmana, VIII, 13. For the construction, of the act of whole and part, e.g. AV, V, 8, 9 (cited by Speyer *Verbsche und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 20, Delbrück *Virgi Synt* I, 285) *enam marmam andhya* when, however, according to Whitney, *Translation of Atharvaveda* the reading should be *marmam*, loc., though *marmam* appears also in the Ajuir edition *samrat* 1957. Somewhat analogous cases appear in Speyer, I 83, Gaebeke, *Der Accusativ* p. 268. Or *mitiladehna* may refer to the lute.

⁸ In Śāṅkhayana it is the Udgātṛ who has throughout to deal with the lute.

⁹ Clearly the *vyana* is a locath at right angles to *prana* and *apana*. This is an unusual conception of it, and is not mentioned in Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, p. 251, E. T., p. 279.

¹⁰ Sayana says that the repetition of these three words denotes a desire that the three worlds be established by the threefold moving of the swing. They are used in Lāṭyāyana IV, 1, 4 in connexion with the playing of the lute. Cf. also Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 339. Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p. 431, n., Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt*, I 162.

¹¹ The *sva* denotes that the action is as before, only the verses being different (Śāyana).

¹² In Śāṅkhayana, XVII, 16 he touches the swing with his breast and then alternately he puts his right and left side over with Mantras almost identical with those here save that *sva* is prefixed and each ends with a dative *svayaya* &c. He then plants his two feet to the east.

hands separately,¹¹ like a serpent about to creep. He should touch the middle plank with his chin, or if there are two¹² the point of joining of the two. (With the words), 'May the Rudras mount thee with the *fristubh* metre, I mount after them,' he lays his right thigh¹³ (over the seat). (With the words), 'May the Ādityas mount thee with the *jagats* metre, I mount after them,' (he lays) his left thigh. (With the words), 'May the All-gods mount thee with the *anustubh* metre, I mount after them,' he mounts (the swing)¹⁴. To the west of his own altar he places his right foot pointing \equiv the east, and then his left¹⁵. If the former is tired, then the latter, if the latter, then the former. But the two together must never be off the ground. The Hotrakas sit down on bundles of grass, and so does the Brahman priest. The Udgatr sits on a stool of *udumbara* wood. If he has to leave for any absolutely necessary action, then having set one to guard, he descends towards the east, and having carried out the exact business he

Then he sits crosswise on the swing and touches the back of it with the Mantra, *Prājapati tvarehatu yayuḥ preṇbhayatu*. This act is preceded and followed by three expirations and three inspirations. The Mantras of the Udgatr on mounting his seat in Latyayana Śrūta Sūtra, III, 12, 8, are like those in Śaṅkhayana omitting *arho 'sa*, but Latyayana, III, 12, 9, permits them to be reduced to simply *gayatriṇa tva chandastarukam*, &c. In Latyayana the verses are said by the Udgatr. Ibid., 10-12. Gantama adds a fifth stoma with *variyena*, Dhanam-jayya has four, and Śaṅkhya only three.

¹¹ The Anandastoma edition reads *yathā ās*, which is nonsense. The reading of Rājendralāla is that clearly of Sayana, who takes the point of comparison to lie in the fact that he raises his hands as a snake about to creep raises its head. *Nona* must be an adverb meaning 'separately'. It might possibly be suggested that it meant here 'without', a sense ascribed by Pāṇini, II, 3, 32, but even then the comparison with the snake would have little point. For the use of *nānā*, cf. Śaṅkhayana Śrūta Sūtra, XVI, 7, 8, 10, XVII, 3, 3, Latyayana Śrūta Sūtra, III, 3, 9 (= Latyayana Śrūta Sūtra, XII, 2, 8) *nānā papakṛtya* Āitayana Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 3, 10 *nandāpi saṁ dāsvat*, Manava Gṛhya Sūtra, II, 18, and other passages in Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 545^b. For a similar metaphor, cf. Āitayana Śrūta Sūtra, VI, 6, 3 *yathā lakṣmī upaśṛīyan*.

¹² There may be two or three, V, 1, 3. They are fastened by the *sūcis*.

¹³ In Śaṅkhayana Śrūta Sūtra, XVII, 16, 1, occurs, *dakṣiṇam āgām atmano 'śikaram*, where Govinda explains by *ārdayat gr̥hāḥ kurvan*, but Sayana here talks of *preṇbhārohanam*, and the sense requires the meaning 'lays over', which is probably meant also in the Śaṅkhayana passage, as pointed out by Friedlander on Śaṅkhayana Āranyaka, I, 7. Cf. Introd., p. 67.

¹⁴ The same series of gods and metres occurs in the Vajasaneyi Samhitā XI, 60, 63, Taittiriya Samhitā, IV, 1, 5, Muṣṭrayana Samhitā, II, 7, 6, Tāndya Mahābrahmana, VII, 6, Śaṅkhayana Āranyaka, XI, 8. Cf. Śatapatha Brahmana, VI, 5, 3 (*agnicayana*) X, 4, 17, and see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 163 and cf. the Rājāsūya verses, Aitareya Brahmana, VIII, 6, 1-4.

¹⁵ The exact sense of this is taken by Sayana to be that the feet are to be used alternately, and this seems correct, though it is not said exactly that the two cannot ever be both on the ground at once. They must not be both off the ground of I, 2, 4. For the gen with *paścat*, cf. Aitareya Brāhmana, VIII, 10, 9 *etya gr̥ham paścat gr̥hasyagñer upastvayanaṁ varabdhaya pīṭṭv antaś śaṅkṣvāna caruṇḍe dātus tatra apyadhāt anantāḥ prapadāṇe paśat*. This corrects Speiser's remark (*Vedic and Sanskrit Syntax*, § 83), followed by Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.*, I, 743, that *paśat* is not so found before the Śrūta Sūtras.

should mount again in the manner above set forth, omitting the utterance {of *bhūh, bhuvah and svar*}¹⁶

■ He instructs the Prastotr, 'In the *pañcavimśa stoma* proclaim the first *prahāra* when either three verses remain to be said, or two and a half¹ or twelve and a half² Jatūkarnya holds that this should be done when there remain twelve and ½ half verses. When the Prastotr has spoken, he repeats³ (the verse), 'Thou art a bird with fair wings I shall speak forth this word, which will declare much,⁴ fare far, produce much, gain much, effect more than much,

¹⁶ Sayana takes *apapaya vṛta* as the form. It may equally be *apapaya vṛta vṛt* being more usual in this sense, as in Manava Grhya Sutra, II, 4, 2 9, 8, Asvilsyana Śrauta Sutra, V, 11, 4, 5 &c.; cf. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, V, 460. If *avayakarmine* is read the sense must be, 'If he should go for (to serve) some one who has something he must do on hand. At first sight this seems easier, but if **karmine* had been original it would hardly have been changed to *karmine* a less obvious construction, while the reverse of this process would be not unnatural. If **karmine* is read see for the formation which is rare in early texts, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, 1, 121, 122. For the dat., cf. Gaebeke, *Der Accusativ im Veda*, p. 135, Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.*, I, 177, 301.

¹ So Sayana explains *ardhatrityam*. The *prahāra* is repeated five times usually before the last *pada* of the verse, cf. Hallebrandt *Ritual Literature*, § 100 and ref. For the imperative in **lat*, signifying an action to be carried out after something else, cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax* p. 363, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 570, 571. The dictum of Whitney that the benedictive sense of the imperative in *lat* was not exemplified, can only be supported on a very narrow interpretation of the word 'benedictive', not merely for classical Sanskrit (where it occurs often in Jaina Kavya texts) but also for Vedic. E.g. in RV III, 21, 2 *āgne vī palya brāhādāś vyādhīm no nēdā bhavātāś annā dyām* it is surely absurd to take *bhavātāś* as imperative as does Oldenberg (*S. B. E.*, XLVI, 288) similarly in Wh. they's own example from RV *yād ārdhvaś śluha drāṣṇehā dhātāś* 'mayst is clearly the sense and may be himself uses in translating the example from the MDh *bhāvan prasādam karutāś*. Probably, therefore in denying the 'benedictive' sense, Whitney refers to that word in the narrowest sense of a blessing pronounced by some person who in the ordinary view is entitled to bless. This is so far borne out by the fact that Pāṇini, III, 1, 50 (*atit ca*) is explained by the *Siddhāntakamandū* (following the *Kaṇva Vṛtta*) as *atit prayoktū dharmaś cāstutū pātrader tyam atit*. In these cases the benedictive is regularly used in Sanskrit e.g. *lat kim anyat ātarmahe kevalam viropranyā bhūyaś* (Vikramorvāśī), or the king's formal *atit*, e.g. *atitpantim ca bhūyaś samapactatukhāś samgamaṁ yajamanam* (Ratnavālī), or the imperative (e.g. in the verse from the Ratnavālī just cited in fact three imperatives occur), but in the early language at any rate I can find no certain example of *lat* so used. But the distinction between a wish and a blessing is evanescent.

² The Śaṅkhayana Aranyaka I, 8, and Śrauta Sutra, XVII, 17, give the *Mantras* in reverse order, and omit the *ukhātavyam*. For *suparno 's garuṁtan* see Vajrasanyī Saṁhitā XII, 4; Śaṅkhayana identifies this with *paṇva*, but see my *Śaṅkhayana Aranyaka*, p. 77, n. 6.

³ Sayana interprets these epithets very inadequately, but it is most probable that they are all genuine including *sva vadyantim*, which has least MS authority. The *Ānandabrahma* edition considers Sayana's text defective but most probably he regarded some of the epithets as obvious, though perhaps he had not *sva vadyantim*. *Latyama* has only after *vadyantim* *bahu karavyantim* *bahu karavyan* *sva gamayantim* *sva gamayisan* *mām smān yajamanam*, see IV, 2, 10. So also Drāhyayana. Śaṅkhayana Aranyaka recognises *bahu karavyantim* *bahur bhūyaś karavyantim* *sva gamayantim* *sva smān yajamanam* *vadyantim* only which resembles

Having called⁹ (to the Adhvaryu), he mutters the word 'speech'. There are three calls¹⁰ (for the Hotr) at the beginning of the Śastra of the *nivid*, and of the concluding verse. The Adhvaryus¹¹ make sounds. On this day one¹² should give much food. They cause a warrior¹³ to pierce a skin. They smite the earth drum and women play lutes¹⁴. There is intercourse of creatures,¹⁵ and a conversation between a student and a courtesan. The Udgatrs sing various Samans for the Nrskevalya Śastra,¹⁶ the Hotr begins with the strophe of the Rajana Saman¹⁷.

⁹ In Sankhayana Śrauta Sūtra XVII 12 5 the *anuyaga* is *ayur aya vishvayam suham ayur aya eva hu drophe vishvatha vinda maghavan vinda it*. The call is *adhvarya sen nam*, Atitaya Brahmana III, 12 &c., Sankhayana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 17, 14. Garbe, *Ritual Literature*, pp 100-102. Caland and Henry, *L'Agnistoma* p 232.

¹⁰ Not as in the *prakṛti* also with the *anuragas* and *dhayyas* (Soyana).

¹¹ *Karanyas* is little if any, more than a simple verb. Cf. epic examples in Holtmann on Whitney's *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 1041, 1068. *Sponer Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax* § 136. *Sanskrit Syntax* § 304. So in Pali and Prakrit. Miller *Pali Grammar*, p 107. This is a preliminary to the beginning of the Śastra. Presumably the words, like those mentioned below, are intended to frighten away demons &c. Cf. Cook *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 1902, p 24. Farnell *Cults of the Greek States*, III, 31, Crooke, *Northern India*, p 196, my *Sankhayana Aranyaka* p 78.

¹² i.e. the *yajamana*.

¹³ The ceremony is described at greater length in Sankhayana Śrauta Sūtra XVII 15. The king or his representative pierces the skin with three arrows which are not allowed to penetrate through. The idea is clearly a rain spell. The arrows pierce the sky and bring down the waters the sky imprisons. This idea may explain the archer in the myth of the descent of Soma though the idea appears distorted there (Bloomfield *J A O S* XVI 22 sq.). For the *āte* and instr. of Gaidiche *Der Accusativ im Veda*, pp 275 sq. Liebeck *Bras Bras*, XI, 272 sq., Delbrück *Altindische Syntax* pp 225 226. *Vergl. Synt* II 117 118 III 2, 4, 2 15.

¹⁴ The drumming is performed on a raw hide stretched over a hole dug in the ground outside (the *vedi* by means of the tail of the sacrificial animal. Sankhayana XVII 5. There are also four or six ordinary drums used. The wives used various instruments. *ghatahakarav avagha tarikah kankas* & *dh pichara it* ibid XVII 3 12. Another list partly the same in Latzyāna, IV, 2 1 8. Cf. Hillebrandt *Vel Myā* II 190. *J A O S* XXIII 309.

For a similar ceremony as to promote fertility, cf. Farnell *Cults of the Greek States*, III 80 103, I rather *Adonis, Attis, Osiris* pp 21 sq. my *Sankhayana Aranyaka* pp 82 sq.

¹⁵ Sankhayana Śrauta Sūtra XVII 6 1, 2 *atha sudravyam striparivartan banfakhatala ity upakalpayanti* | *to i etat puranam istannam na karyam* | Apastamba cited by Soyana, says *ullataryam tādityam im pūnīratyā magadhya ca parivartayanti* (al. *parivartayanti*) see \XI, 19. Cf. Taittiriya Samhita VII, 4, 9 4. The conversation of the student and courtesan is given in Latzyāna IV, 3 9-11, the *utkhana* in 17. Cf. Kāṭhaka Samhitā, XXIV 5. Latzyāna Śrauta Sūtra XIII 3 v. Schroeder *Mysterium und Aktus* pp 161 sq. who overlooks the force of the plural (*caranti*) in the *haphala*, Oldenberg *Gott gel. Anz* 1909 p 77 n 1, my note, *J R A S*, 1909 p 205, n 2.

¹⁶ Soyana explains that the Udgatrs sing their Samans first of all ending with the *nyaman* : *man* the first tristich of which serves as the commencement of the Nrskevalya Śastra of the Hotr. On the verses cf. Oldenberg *Religion des Veda*, pp 383 sq. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, X, 141 sq. 376 sq.

¹⁷ The Latzyāna Śrauta Sūtra, which goes into further detail mentions also as part of the

6 'That was the oldest in the worlds' (RV, X, 120),¹ 'That fame of thine, O Maghavan, through thy greatness' (RV, X, 54), 'He groweth more for strength' (RV, VI, 30), and the three verses beginning, 'Thee, manliest of men, with songs, with hymns' (RV, III, 51, 4), (are the commencement of the Śāstra) Here some say² that one should take from the body verses the two quarter-verses, 'Join with the sweet what is sweeter than sweet' (RV, X, 120, 3^d), and 'The sweet with the sweet hast thou conquered' (ibid., 3^d), and replace them with the wing quarter-verses, 'O Maghavan, O Indra, the strong steeds' (RV., VII, 33 2^d), and 'O Indra, grant a cow, a chariot horse' (RV, VI, 46, 2^d), and put in place of the latter those other two. He thus wins the profit of a cow' and

ceremonies a fight between an Ārya (Vaiśya) and a Śūdra for a skin which is compared with the sun and the appointment of persons to praise and criticize the acts of the priests, IV, 3, perhaps in order to avert the evil eye (Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, III 172), of the abuse of the Roman triumph. The first ceremony clearly shows the nature of the rite as a sun spell, which has many parallels in different parts of the world (Usener, *Archiv f. Religionswissenschaft*, 1904, pp. 297-313), as Agastya on IV, 3 7, points out. It is discussed in Taittiriya Brāhmana, V, 2, 6, 7. For ritual *strophologia* as stimulating vegetation or serving a particular purpose, cf. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, III, 104, IV, 267, Frazer, *Golden Bough*, Ist, 97, Crooke *Northern India* p. 193. v. Schroeder *Mysterium und Mimus*, pp. 309 sq.

¹ See I 3 3-8. This Āhanga deals with the body and the *sudakṣa* verse following it. It corresponds in Śākhayana Āranyaka, II, 1, and Śāstra Sūtra, XVIII, 1.

² Śākhayana Śrāuta Sūtra, XVIII, 14 7, Āranyaka, II, 1, 11, omits the last two *padas* and does not replace them, but puts them before the *ardhara*. The stanza RV, VII, 33, 2^d, occurs in the right the stanza RV, VI, 46, 1^a, in the left wing. The Śātapatha Brāhmana, VIII, 6, 2, 3 seems to agree with Śākhayana, though not precisely. Eggeling *S B E*, XLIII, 115, n. Eggeling's explanation of the *ardhara* in the Śātapatha as referring to RV, X, 120, 3^d, and VIII, 30 1^a, seems to overlook the fact that in the Śākhayana the *ardhara*, X, 120, 3^d, carries with it the *ardhara* VIII, 69 1^a, making up in all *ardhara*, they are called *tau* in Āranyaka, II 1.

³ This is practically a defining genitive. Cf. IV *mayah satvīyam*, and contrast Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 295. Speyer *Indische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 62. Delbrück (*Alindische Syntax*, pp. 123-124) gives examples of the genitive of material and origin, and see *ergl. Sint.*, I, 340, 346 sq. The construction *sam paksayoh patindja* is curious. The *sam* is joined with *patanaya* by Sāyana and we might compare for this infra, *upa-āpte*, V, 3, 3, or *sam* might be taken with *dhatte* (cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 2031). The use of the genitive⁴ with *patanaya* (as with *optas*, Śākhayana Āranyaka, II, 5, 6, &c.) disentitles it to be regarded as a real finite of Speyer, *Indische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 43, Whitney, *l. c.*, §§ 237, 282. The easy conjecture *sam*, though rather tempting, is unnecessary. The conjunction of cow and horse is truly Vedic, cf. Indra's hymn, RV, X, 119 1 *itā vā ita me māno gām dītam sanuīyam ita*, Atharvaveda, XII, 1, 5 *gauram atānam*, &c., Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 57, Bloomfield, *False Concordance*, p. 346. For *dītan dhatte*, cf. Śākhayana Śrāuta Sūtra, XIV, 28, 9, XV, 6, 7.

⁴ It is possible to think of *paksayoh* as a dative (cf. Speyer, *Indische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 12, for the confusion of *śākyān* and *ek* forms), but this is not essential.

a horse, and the wings are made strong to fly. He intertwines these hymns with the verse *nadam va oḍaṇam* (RV, VIII, 69, 2) joining quarter verse with quarter-verse, making them into *brhati* verses, so that the quarter-verses of the *nada* hymn are second. He also inserts in the first stanza the syllables of the word *purusa*, one in each quarter-verse, at the end, save in the case of the third quarter-verse. Thus does he intertwine them. We will also set (a verse forth) as an example, thus:—

śad id asa dhūmanem pṛcīham pu
nadam va oḍaṇam |
śalo jajña ugras tīsanrmno ru
nadam śyūvalino 3m ||
śuho jajñano ne rinati śatrūn
patim vo aghnyanam |
anu 3am visre madanīy ūmah so
dhenunam sudhyaso 3m ||

The verse should be thrice repeated*. Should (the Udgātṛs) sing as the Rājana Sāman other verses which occur (in the hymns enumerated), then (the Hotṛ) recites them in their own* place, but here (at the beginning of the Śāstra) he recites these verses (i.e. RV, X, 120, 1-3). If the other verses do not occur in these hymns, he should take as many out of the hymns mentioned and recite the (other verses) in their place, but still recite these verses (RV, X, 120, 1-3) here. (The verses removed) in this case are to be those before the *sudadohas* verse. The Śāstra always begins with the verses commencing, 'That was the

* The *plvis* and the *em* after the fourth *padā* are probably meant. Cf. Śaṅkhāyana, II cc, and I, § 1. Rajendralala and the Ānandaśrama edition are both inconsistent. For the *plvis*, see Wackertagel *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 297-300. Both *sudhyaso 3m* and *yada tino 3m* present curious forms, which may be compared with the rule recognized in Pāṇini, VI, 1, 92, that *em* with a preceding *a* vowel gives *em* and this Sandhi in its turn has easily parallels (Macdonell, *1st edic Grammar*, p. 64). So in Manava Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 4, 4 *vanam* stands, in my opinion, for *vanam+em* (cf. II, 7, 1). See also Caland and Heary, *L'Agnihotra*, pp. 212, 166, 278, 232, 237, 238, &c. for examples of this Sandhi.

* To make up twenty five verses, I 3, 4, 5, 6, Śaṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II 1 *evam vārtidm prathamam trish śamsati pādair uttarak*.

* Literally, 'in their place'. The Udgātṛs may either adopt *śad id asa* at the beginning or *śatṛya* or use other verses in the enumerated hymns, or use quite new verses, but in all cases the Hotṛ must stick to *śad id asa* as a commencement, and must not follow the strophe of the Rājana Sāman. The new verses are to be inserted before the *sudadohas* verse, omitting a corresponding number of those in the ordinary version. If the verses occur in the hymns enumerated, then they are simply recited in their own original place, since the whole of the first three hymns is included in the Śāstra, and the three verses, 7, 31, 4-6, count presumably as a hymn for this purpose. Cf. 3 on V, 2, 2. For the construction, cf. Aitareya Brahmana, V, 7, 1. *mahīmanisv atra stutale hīkṛvareṇa sāmā*.

oldest in the worlds' (RV, X, 120, 1) The reply of the Adhvaryu is not altered.⁷ (Then comes) the *śūdadohas* verse, beginning, 'Of that milk yielder' (RV., VIII, 69, 3)⁸

⁷ The form used in the *grakṛts* is not altered as it is in the *śoḍaśin* rite (*Sāyana*) On the *pratigara*, see Weber, *Ind Stud*, X, 36, n 3, Eggeling, *S B F*, XXI 1, 316, Sabbathier, *Agnitoma*, pp 55, 56, Hillebrandt, *Ritual Literatur*, p. 104, n 45

⁸ The verses laid down in Śākhāyana are, after a *tūsmantama* of three verses, RV, X, 120, 1-3. 4-9. X, 29, 1-8, X, 55, 6-8. X, 54 6; X, 54, 2. X, 56, 1, making 23, the first being twice repeated, and the whole interspersed with the *pādas* of the *nada* hymn. In X, 120, 3, however, the third and fourth *pāda* together with the corresponding *pādas* of the *nada* hymn are omitted, and placed before the *devapādis* (II, 11).

After the body verses the order in Śākhāyana and the Aitareya differs as shown below —

	Sutra, Śākhāyana, XVI, 2	Āranyaka, II, 2
Head verses	"	"
Neck verses (with <i>śāṇḍha</i> , cervical column, <i>J R A S</i> , 1907, pp 2, 3)	" 3	" 3
Right side (<i>akṣa</i> , <i>bahu</i> , <i>grahastaka</i>)	" 4	" 4, 5
Left side (ditto) ⁹	" 5	" 4, 5
Back (<i>anukṣa</i> , backbone, perhaps lumbar por- tion in special, <i>J R A S</i> , 1907, pp 7, 8)	" 6	" 6
<i>Aśtis</i>	" 7-13	" 7-10
<i>Vāta</i> hymn	" 14	" 11
<i>Devapādis</i> (with <i>ardharāva</i>)	" 15	" 12
<i>Anulagna</i> hymn	" 16	" 13
<i>Asvapana</i>	" 17	" 14
<i>Anurukha samaminaya</i>	" 18	" 15
<i>Tristupakṣa</i>	" 19, 20	" 16
Neck verses	Aitareya, V, 2, 1	I, 4, 1
Head verses	" "	"
Vertebrae-verses	" "	"
Right wing	" V, 2, 2	I, 4, 2
Left wing	" "	"
<i>Devapādis</i>	" "	"
<i>Aśtis</i>	" V, 2, 3-5	I, 4, 3
<i>Vāta</i> hymn	" V, 2, 5	I, 5, 1
<i>Orū</i> , &c.	" V, 3, 1, 2	I, 5, 1, 2

⁹ It should be noted, however, that this division, which is that adopted by Dr Friedlander as doubtful as regards the two sides which (Introd, p. 10) he divides into shoulder, arm, and hand. For the word *śāṇḍha* (really 'cervical column', Hoernle *J R A S*, 1906, p. 915) occurs in the section dealing with the *grāva* verses, and the word *akṣa* (*yc*) or *akṣa*, both of which are used in Āranyaka II, 3, as regards the part rendered as 'shoulder', seems rather to denote 'collar bone'. At least, so I infer from the fact that *akṣa* has this sense in Caraka and Saṅgita (Hoernle, *J R A S*, 1907, p. 13), and *akṣa* this sense in the Śatapatha Brahmana. Possibly the reading should be *akṣam* in Āranyaka, *I c* of *akṣa śhōmāśa* (sic) just after, and cf I, 2, 2, n 11, but *akṣa* is good sense. The exact divisions are probably (a) collar bone, (b) arm, (c) hand.

ADHYĀYA 2

(Then come) the neck verses 'Of Indra,¹ the smiter, the powerful, the earnest, who has the world, are might and strength, great and delightful The mighty² overcomes

¹ These verses occur with many variants in the Atharvaveda, VI, 33 and also in the Paippalada recension, the Naigeya text of the Samaveda, I, 588 which has *arjya yujas tujē jana z inam riddh* and has not the second two verses, and Śaṅkayana Śrauta Sutra, XVII, 2, where they run *yajedam oja arjyas tujō yujō balam sahaḥ | Indraya ranyam brhat || ana dhr̥tam vipanyaya nādhr̥sa adadhrtaya | dhr̥tanam dhr̥stanam īśatā || as no dadātu taji rajam puruṣaṅgasamdr̥sāḥ | Indrah pātu śanastanam jamaḥ ||* It should, however, be noted that *balam* is merely a conjecture of Hillebrandt's for *vanam* of all his MSS. It is a probable one. The AV version is unintelligible, see Whitney's *Translation* p. 305. In the version given, which is purely conjectural, I have taken *arjyah* as a genitive from Śaṅkayana (the change of *u* and *a* is easy, the accent is dubious), like *tujō* and *yujō*, presumably also genitives. Sayana as usual gives no help, he takes *arjyah* as either (1) *nishcheśayam sarvato raijyaham*, or (2) *yajatpala nam sarvato raijyaham*. *Tujō tujō* is *yogo tairuṇam hamsakā*. *Vanam* is *bhaktair zana myam*. The AV has *ā rjya yujas tujē jana z inam riddh* | and *nādhr̥sa ā dadhr̥sate dhr̥sant dhr̥stā īśatā | purā yathā vyathā īśatā Indraya nādhr̥sa īśatā*. The Paippalada differs greatly.

² The translation again is purely conjectural. Whitney, by reading *adhrt* + (inf), *dhr̥stam dhr̥stam*, and *īśatā*, makes it, '(He is) not to be dared against, (his) might, dared, dares daring against (others), as, of old, his fame (was) unwavering, Indra's might (is) not to be dared against.' Taking the Astareya text as it stands, I think we must resolve *nādhr̥sa* as *nā dhr̥sa* (b) and take the word as an adjective meaning 'impetuous'. I think *nādhr̥sa* however, almost certainly right (cf. RV, V, 8, 5), 'He is not to be dared against'. The editions and Whitney with Sayana read the two words following as *ā dadhr̥sa dadhr̥santam*. This is quite possible, though the change in quantity is remarkable, but it seems to have escaped notice that *ā dadhr̥sant adhr̥santam* is quite possible and could have the same sense while keeping the prefix *a* in both cases and restoring the metre (*ā dadhr̥sant ā dhr̥san in*) and explaining the Śaṅkayana text. If *nādhr̥sa* is read I would not take the participle as a neuter nom., but translate, 'He dares against the daring his might is dread'. This avoids the inconvenience of the idea of might daring, and the rare use of the present participle as a finite verb. The second half of the line is very obscure. *Ati vyāthitā* occurs also in RV, X, 86, 2 and here as there Sayana explains it as a verbal form which is quite impossible, 'When Indra caused his foe to fall'. It might however mean, 'Who's trembling (cf. Naigh, II, 23) passed from Indra, referring to the terrors which so often fell on Indra before he showed his might. For a different theory as in *vyāthitā* (= track), see RV, IV, 4, 3 (Oldenberg *S B E*, XLVI 351), AV, IV, 21, 3 with Whitney's note, and see Geldner, *Indische Studien*, II 39. Geldner holds that *vyāthitā* originally means 'Falschheit' and thence 'Malice, Zorn Ungnade, Ärger, Hass, Feindschaft', and so has the gen. of the subject or object. So he renders RV IV, 4, 3 as, 'no one approaches thee when angry,' and in AV, VI 33 2 takes *purā yathā vyāthitā* (this is the AV accentuation as in AV, IV, 21, 3) *īśatā Indraya nādhr̥sa īśatā*, as 'Like a citadel (cf. *aryā* and *īry*, Fickel *Indische Studien*, I, 185) unapproachable, as the anger, the fame, the

not him who is exceeding strong His vigour is dreadful When aforetime trembling passed from him, Indra's might was dreadful May he give us that wealth, wealth of tawny hue Indra is the lord, the most mighty among men' (Then comes) the *sūdadohas* verse. The head verses are in *gayatrī* metre, beginning, 'The singers call aloud to Indra' (RV, I, 7, 1) If (the Udgātr̥s) sing the Sāman with other verses which occur (in the service), then the two sets are to be interchanged in place.³ If the other verses are ones not occurring, or some occur and some not, (then they should be inserted in the place of verses occurring which should be taken out) The last verse of the hymn (should be recited, the insertion being made before it) and then the *sūdadohas* verse. Then come

strength of Indra' Unhappily he does not cite or discuss this passage, where of course *puṣṭ* cannot be made by any effort of the imagination to be a noun. But accepting the sense 'wrath', then AV, VI, 33, 2 would give the sense 'As aforetime, the anger', &c., and this passage might be rendered, 'As of old (*parā ydē*) his anger is excessive' (*asē*), and on the whole this is perhaps the least unlikely version of a very difficult and probably corrupt text. Cf. v Schroeder, *Mysterium und Alimus*, p 316, n 2, whose version of RV, X, 86, 2, suggests 'because of anger

For the form of the verse, cf e.g. Vajasaneyi Samhitā I, 8 *dāṛ as dhūrta dhurvantam | dāṛva tam ja man durats tam dhūrta yam dhurva mah*, and Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Lit*, I, 129. In the next verse the AV reads *idm* (Ppp *nd*) *urum* and *turitamās* (APr., III, 96 IV, 29) while the Ppp the *com*, and one MS have *dadhatu*, and the commentary on the AV and two MSS (out of three) in Śaṅkṛāyana have **iḍṛsam*. One MS of Śaṅkṛāyana has *purum* the others *puram*. *Tandistama* occurs in RV, I, 190, 5, II, 33, 3. For the dat inf in *i* cf Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 970.

³ This is Sayana's version. The Anandāśrama reads *ubhayaśamsthā na viparyaya* with the opposite meaning but this is less probable. The apodosis to the last clause is borrowed from the indication in V, 1, 6. As the next clause shows, the insertion of the new verses is to be made before the last verse preceding the *sūdadohas* verse and not directly before that verse. The word *samamnatasa* refers here to verses occurring in the hymn itself. The form *ubhayaśamsthānaḥ viparyayaḥ* however presents great difficulty for the use of *ubhayaś* in compounds is confined to cases like **akṛa*, **pina*, **kasta* &c. and it is hardly likely that the second member of the compound is *śamsthāna* or that the fem is kept because *sc* is fem (Vackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II 1, 49 51). But, further, there is no special meaning in *śamsthāna* and the conjecture *ubhayaśam śamsthānaviparyayaḥ* is possible. *Ubhayaśam* (*ream*) is precisely correct for two sets of three verses (cf RV, I, 26, 9, 189, 7, and regularly later, cf Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 272), and Sayana's version in no way confirms either the reading of Rājendralāla or the Anandāśrama. The form would be very rare, the ordinary feminine being *ubhayaś* (common in the Aitareya Brahmana) and possibly *ubhayaś* is the Vedic adverb. It may be noted that R's version of the *com*, *śasam arthā* (R⁴ against R¹ and R²) alone makes sense. *Sa śasam madhye* being nonsense. Cf. introd, p 9.

The Śaṅkṛāyana Śruti Sūtra, XVIII, 2, gives the head verses thus, RV, I, 7, 1-3 I, 6, 7-9, I, 84 13-15, VIII, 76, 10 12, VIII, 93, 1-3, any of those used by the Sāman singers. Some use I, 50, 1-9, to correspond with the Sāman singers. If the latter use only I, 50, 1-3, then the reciter can take any two of the other *śras* to make up the nine verses. As in the Aitareya, the recitation is by half verses, and the *sūdadohas* verse occurs at the end.

the vertebrae verses: 'The Soma is pressed for thee, come to the sacrifice, rejoice in the carouse, rich in gifts, for wealth O Indra, thou art generous and young for us to sing' He can overcome his foes in slaying Vritas, he is skilful and is plunger We magnify our leader, Indra Impetuous, bright, the leader, the dweller on the mountains, hastening towards you, Indra, shouting aloud, with his eternal steeds' (Then comes) the *sādanōhas* verse The three sets of verses neck, head, and vertebrae, are all to be repeated with a pause at the half-verse⁷

2 The (verses of the) night wing are connected with the Rathantara Saman The Rathantara has for its strophe, 'We praise thee, O hero' (RV, VII, 32, 22), and for its antistrophe, 'Thee for the first drink' (RV., VIII, 3, 7), both being

⁶ These verses contain an unusual number of rare expressions, and the uncertainty as to their accent adds to the difficulty The reading of *vijrah* is very doubtful R in the commentary, which is followed by Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, S, and the MSS have *vijarah*, while Sayana perhaps read *vidrah* (śvistalokadharani grnadhya asmadagre kalyayitum atra hrste Mata) I have translated the *vijrah* (vujarāḥ) of R's text, and taken *grnadhya* as an infinitive practically equivalent to an imperative, 'Let us sing of,' cf Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 411 sq.; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 981 d, Hopkins, *A J P*, XIII, 21 sq.; Speyer, *Deutsche und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 116

⁷ *Vijrah*, Sayana renders as *scitum lakṣya* Cf RV, III, 3, 5, where it is an epithet of Agni The *id no nistānam* looks like an imitation of older verses, such as RV, II, 6, 5, without much regard to their construction Possibly the reading should be (cf on IV) *idm* (which would become *san* before *no*) So Maṣṭrayant Saṃhita IV, 12, 6, has *sa dānū kṛatū dhruvā idmam*, but in Taittiriya Saṃhita, III, 3, 11 *idm*, &c *idm* may be from the root *id* (cf Blau Müller's conjecture on RV, IV, 2, 4, *S B E* XLVI, 330) and meaning 'swift' S takes *racahatur* as one word, but this makes nonsense of Sayana The form is unusual, see Whitney, *Grammar*, § 1161 d

⁸ *Sāmajik* (for the form, cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, 1, 73, 74) apparently means the 'bringer together' *Rjitā* cannot have the sense which it normally has (see Hillebrandt, *I ad Rjitā*, I, 133 sq.; Bloomfield, *J A O S*, XVI, 39) and which is here ascribed to it by Sayana, *vijrahakādharaśarānam* In RV, III, 32, 1, it seems to mean impetuous, and cf *rjitā*, *ibid*, I, 32, 6 I am here explained as the husband and wife engaged in the sacrifice, Rājendralāla reads *idm* which is quite wrong though followed in Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 205 It would of course be acc with *sāmajik* *Sāradbhū* *cruṣ* possibly merely means 'as usual', or 'in his eternal courses' Cf *dhruv*, 'in due way,' RV, I, 68, 4, 95, 6, *arjāḥ dṛuḥ*, IV, 2, 11, *S B E*, XLVI 437 These verses are unparalleled in other texts

⁹ This means, as Sayana and Śākhayana show, that there is a pause at the end of the half-verse (and *om* at the end of the verse) The other possibilities are (1) pause at each *pāda*, with *om* at half verse (2) no pause, *om* at end. The Āvalāyana Śānta Sūtra contains examples of all kinds, see I, 239

¹⁰ Cf I, 4, 2

¹¹ If so it might be taken as two words and translate it 'the giver is to be praised' Cf *id dānū grā* in RV, VI, 34, 5, and cf Śākhayana Aranyaka, XII, 10

pragātha verses. These four *brhatis* he turns into six* (Then come the hymns), 'I shall proclaim the deeds of Indra' (RV, I, 32), 'In thee since our father, Indra' (RV, VII, 18) fifteen verses only, 'Who is sharp horned, terrible like a bull' (RV, VII, 19), 'Dread is he born for strength, the mighty' (RV, VII, 20), 'Ye have uttered glorious prayers' (RV, VII, 23), 'For greatness, O dread Indra with thine aid' (RV, VII, 25) five hymns, 'From far or near may Indra be with us' (RV, IV, 20) is the *sampata* hymn. 'Thus in the Soma, in the carouse' (RV, I, 80, 1) is a *pankti* verse. (Then comes) the *sudadohas* verse. (The verses of the) left wing are connected with the Brihat Saman. The Brihat has for its strophe, 'For thee we hail' (RV, VI, 46, 1) and for its antistrophe, 'Come hither to the worship' (RV, VIII, 61, 7), both being *pragātha* verses. These four *brhatis* he turns into six. (Then come the hymns) 'Praise him who surpasses in strength' (RV, VI, 18), 'Thou art attached to the pressed Soma, Indra' (RV, VI, 23) three hymns, 'Thou art the only lord of riches, O lord of riches' (RV, VI, 31) eight hymns, 'What whose sacrifice has he increased?' (RV, IV, 23) is the *sampata* hymn. 'Indra is born for the carouse' (RV, I, 81, 1) is a *pankti* verse. (Then comes) the *sudadohas* verse. The right wing is connected with the Rathantara Saman, and so is the *pañcadāśa stoma*†. There are one hundred and one (verses) in it, and it is called the Vasisthaprāśāha. The left wing is connected with the Brihat Saman and so is the *asṭadāśa stoma*. There are one hundred and two verses, and it is called the Bharadvājaprasāha. The (verses of the) tail, as being *tripadas* are connected with the Bhadrā Saman. There are nine verses from the Sambhūta. 'These worlds let us conquer' (RV, X, 137) and 'Come hither with thy splendour' (RV, X, 172) and there are also other verses not from the Sambhūta‡. (These are), 'Ye priests, sing forth a song to Indra who beyond all others slays the foe, that he may rejoice'§.

* The two *pragāthas* give only four *brhatis*. The six are made up by repeating twice the fourth *pāda* of I V, VII 32, 21, and reading with it the first half of I V, VII, 31, 21. Then the fourth *pāda* of this second *brhātī* is twice repeated and with the second half of I V, VII 31, 21 makes the third *brhātī*. By I, 1, 6, for the *pāda*, I V, VII, 32, 21, is to be substituted I V, I, 130, 3.

† The Rathantara Saman is the basis of the *pañcadāśa stoma* or hymn form. The term *vasisthaprāśāha* is clearly the technical name of what is called elsewhere (see *St. Petersburg Diet.*) *vasisthaprasādhani*. Similarly in the case of the *asṭadāśa stoma* and cf. II 2 2, n 11 for the attributions. The syntax of I V, VI 31, 1, is curious: see Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 106, I ergi. *Synt.* I 39, and cf. in Latin *Ecclus.* III 29 *censuram trabente solutus*. For *prāśāha*, cf. *Z. D. M. G.* XLV III 548.

‡ These are given also in Śākhāyana Śrauta Sūtra XI III 25 where they follow *ena brāhma* &c. Some are also in the Samaveda. The two I V hymns have five and four verses.

§ Śākhāyana has *yajate*. See Samaveda I 446 II, 463 where are *tyajate* and *yajm yajate*. For the form, see Whitney *Sanskrit Gram.* ar. § 810. In VII of Samaveda has *yajate*.

forth, that dost know indeed all that has been aforetime or that is now."¹¹ 'O Mitra and Varuna, grant us strength and food. O Indra, make us strength abounding'¹² '(Grant) prosperity, strength, wealth, to him who seeks gain'¹³ Soma impels not him who keeps not vows, gain will not come near him' Then come three *śrīpādas*,¹⁴ beginning, 'This Brahman' Then comes one *śrīpāda*,

¹¹ This occurs in Samaveda, I, 450, as *astvārya prā stobha furā va sām yādī rehā munda*, which Benfey renders, 'Vor allem sei gepriesen nun, seist du uns ferne oder nah,' but the passive use of *astvā* is not probable. My rendering is of course very conjectural, and ■ supposes that *astvā* is read.

¹² This verse, as far as the latter part is concerned, agrees with Samaveda I, 455, which runs *urjā mitrā vṛnuṣaḥ pṛvāśāḥ pīṭarim śtam kṛmāḥ na Indra*. Here *pṛvāśā* has the three deities as its subject, and its use is therefore regular. But in the Aranyaka text the plural is quite irregular, cf I, 2, 2, n. 7. The text could be amended, but it is clearly original. Cf the strange *astvāśā* in Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa, III, 77, on the other hand, *astvāśāḥ* = *astvāśāḥ* in Apastamba Gṛhya Sūtra, VI, 24, 15 (Oldenberg, *S B E*, XLII, 181, n). For the form *kṛmāḥ*, cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 704, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 62, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 310. See also Oldenberg *Prolegomena*, pp. 393 sq.; Zolaty's articles in *Pennsylvania Oriental Journal*, II and III, and Arnold's *Vedic Metre*, Chap. VI, with whose results I regret I cannot on the whole agree (cf *J R A S*, 1906, p. 718, and *Vedic Metre*, pp. xiii-xiv).

¹³ In Samaveda, I, 441, this verse runs *idm padm maghdm rayistm nā kāmam avatāḍ hinoṣ nā śrīḥ rayim* (for the form cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 2297b), meaning 'Health, a dwelling, prosperity to him who seeks wealth. The man who pays no vows obtains not his desire, he wins not wealth.' Sayana renders *rayistm* as *haviṣāḥ samaya dhanaḥ dhotam*, but this cannot be right. If the Aranyaka form is correct, it is presumably from *rayim*, ■ in *gāṇa*, RV, I, 18, 2, to &c. It may of course also be the acc or nom neut of *rayistm*, compare *gāṇim dāyam*, RV, VI, 83, 20. The only probable construction of the text here is 'there is (or "may there be") in the seeker of wealth, prosperity', &c. R has *rayiḥ*, which is clearly wrong as probably is *śrīḥ*. For the omission of the verb in the Samaveda version, cf RV, II 6 5. Pischel, *Vedic Studies*, I 29. Geldner, *ibid*, 166, n. 7 on V, 1, 4.

¹⁴ These verses (the accents are from the Samavedi) are given in Āvalīyana Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 2, 6. *id brahmā yā pṛvā Indra nāma brahṇe nā vā smṛtya yāḥ pāṭha Indra tvāḥ jantu vadyāḥ nā tvāḥ k. chavasaḥ pāṭha gāṇa gāṇa na samyāḥ*. They occur also (with *pr* for *pr* for *pr* and *na* for *na* in 3) in Śākhya Śrauta Sūtra, IV, 6, 6, and (with *pāṭha* for *pāṭha*) in Samaveda, II, 2216 (= I, 433) 2218 (= I, 423, 2217. The first verse also occurs in Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, II, 4, 3, 20 (*prāṭha* only); III, 7, 9, 4, and the *prāṭha* in Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, IV, 3. See Benfey and Griffiths' translations, and for *gāṇa*, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 719. Perhaps it may be taken as a passive, cf RV, I, 79, 11. *add* *gāṇa* *astvāśā*, rendered as 'is praised' by Oldenberg (*S B E*, XLII 106), and see Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax* p. 264. On the other hand, cf nn. 6 and 11 above, where

¹⁵ So also *parāḥ* means 'he sings' and 'he is praised' according to Oldenberg, *l. c.* p. 136, and Deussen, *Ess. Ess.*, XIII, 297. I am not sure that in any case the passive sense is quite essential. The uncertainty is of course a sign of early date, of the Middle and Passive in Latin, Lindsay, *Latin Language*, pp. 519-521, Delbrück, *l. c.* IV, 423.

'To the yokes for him' (RV VII, 34.4),¹⁵ the *sūdadāhar* verse, the *dhājyā* verse, 'What he won' (RV, X, 74.6), and the *sūdadāhar* verse

ś *stobhata* and *prś* *stobha* must be active, and so here and in RV, I, 79, 12, the activity may be that of the god not of the poet. In the RV passage it has just been said *agnir rāksamāḥ stobhata*, and I see no reason to give a passive sense to *grṇite*. The verses may then be rendered, 'The holy season's lord, Indra by name, famous, utters praise. Let gifts approach thee, Indra, as paths the way. Like songs, to thee, lord of might do men fare eagerly.' It should be noted that in I, 438, the Samaveda has *grṇe*, but in II 1216 *grṇe*. The accent on *grṇe* is quite unaccountable,¹⁶ and can only be explained by the fact that the Taittiriya Brahmana,¹⁷ II 10, has *gand*. In the Aitareya only *asa brahma* (not as Aufrecht's text *asā*) is cited, a striking instance of the danger of arguments from the use of *prastāva* only as a sign of later redaction (cf. Bloomfield's proof of the posteriority of the Gopālha Brahmana to the Vaitāna Sūtra, Jairoś, p. 26), since the argument would show that the Aitareya Brahmana was later than the Āśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra, cf. also Oldenberg's remarks in *Gott. gel. Anz.*, 1907, p. 234, n. 1.

¹⁵ Śaṅkhāyana adds the verses, RV, VIII, 29.4, and VI, 17, 15, but as there are only six instead of nine new verses the total number of *dhājyā* verses made up is still only twenty one. The Aitareya adds a twenty second verse see I, 4, 2.

The passages corresponding to the *patas* are given in Śaṅkhayana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 4. 5, thus the sides are divided into the *akṣar*, *bakur* (arms), and *prahastakāś* (hand). The *akṣar* are VI, 47, 8, and a verse not from the RV, *sa turye samayam, āc*. Then for the right *bakur*, the strophe of the *rathantara samam* repeated as a *kāśubh*, then the *sūdadāhar* verse. Then similarly the antistrophe and a *dhājyā* verse. Then the *rathantara prastāva*. Then the hymn, RV, VI, 22, exchanging for VI, 22, 2, the verse X, 28, 2. For the left *bakur* precisely the same treatment of the *brāhṇa samam*, but no *dhājyā*, and the hymn X, 28, with VI, 22, 2, as its second verse. The *prahastakāś* are respectively VIII, 97, 13-15 and VIII, 97, 10-12.

Then comes XVIII, 6, the *catvārttaraṇa*, viz. RV, VIII, 92. 19. 22, VIII 12, 22-24, I, 20, 1-3, VIII, 11, 3, 4 (a *prastāva*, or 3. 5), by half verses, I, 80, 1-3 (*pañcāśamāṇa*), VI, 34. 1-3, and I, 83. 4. 6 *pañchar*, then the *sūdadāhar*.

It is worthy of note that, just as the Aitareya refers only to the *asa brahma* verses by the *prastāva* of the first verse, so the Śaṅkhayana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 15. 4 also uses only the *prastāva*. It is almost impossible to avoid the conclusion that this book XVIII (and presumably, also XVII) must be not earlier nor later than the main body of the Sūtra and this will modify in some extent Hillebrandt's view, *Ritual Liturgien*, p. 25. Similarly the Āraṇyaka may be written after the Āśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra. Cf. my note in *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 410-412.

In the Aitareya Brahmana, VI, 18, 1, it is said that Viśvāmitra was the seer of RV, IV, 19, 21 and 23 and that Viśvadeva *avṛjāta* them, *tan kṛpam samapātāt*, while in IV, 30, 2, RV, IV, 20 and 21, are also declared to be *avṛjāta* hymns. Viśvadeva *va imāśi śikān apātyāt tan samapātāt samapātāt* (See, *Die Sagenstoffe des Rigveda*, p. 103).

¹⁶ It falls under none of the exceptional cases, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 106. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 597, 598, Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 70 sq., Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 21-29, Oldenberg, *Z D M G.*, LX, 707-740, see my note, *J. R. A. S.*, 1908, p. 202.

¹⁷ Also the Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 2, 13, cited by Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 207.

3. (Then come) the eighty *gājatrī* tristuchs¹ He takes out the last three verses of the hymn, 'Great is Indra who by his might' (RV, VIII, 6). (Then come) three verses of the hymn, 'A cake for us' (RV., VIII, 78). Of the verses following, 'Indra indeed is the drinker of Soma beyond others' (RV., VIII, 2, 4), he omits the last three. Of the others he omits, 'Sweet are the draughts of Soma, come hither' (ibid, 28), and puts in its place the verse, 'No other mighty one' (RV, VIII, 80, 1). (Then comes) one verse, 'Born with a hundred strengths' (RV, VIII, 77, 1). (Then comes) the remainder (of the hymn, RV, VIII, 92), 'Much invoked, much praised' (ibid, 2). He omits the last verse of the hymn, 'To him that hath renowned treasures' (RV, VIII, 93 1). (Then come the hymns), 'The deeds of the impetuous one' (RV, VIII, 32), 'Those that kindle Agni' (RV, VIII, 45) and 'For us, O Indra, rich in food' (RV, VIII, 81) and the following hymn. (Then comes) the *sudadohas* verse

4 (Then come) the eighty *brhāṣī* tristuchs¹ There are twenty nine verses

¹ They are—

RV, VIII, 6, 1-45	=	45 verses
" 78, 1-3	=	3 "
" 2 4-39	=	36 "
(For verse 28, RV, VIII, 80, 1, is substituted)		
" 77, 1	=	1 "
" 92, 2 33	=	31 "
" 93 1-33	=	33 "
" 32	=	30 "
" 45	=	42 "
" 81	=	9 "
" 82	=	9 "
<hr/>		
= 240 verses.		

In Śaṅkhuṣaṇḍa Śrauta Sutra, \VIII, 7, the verses are RV, VIII 6, 1-45, 2, 4 27, 31-39, 45 1-42, 32, 1-30, 92 4 18, 22-33, 93 4 18, 22-33, III, 51, 10-12, \VIII, 76, 10-12, 69, 4-6, \I, 45, 1-30, which gives 81 *verses* and not 80. The number is reduced to 80 by the omission of one of the three *verses* III, 51, 10-12, VIII, 76, 10-12, 69 4-6.

¹ These are—

RV, \III, 1, 1-29	=	29 verses.
" 3 1-6, 9 20	=	18 "
" 4 1-14	=	14 "
" 33, 1-15	=	15 "
VII, 32, 1, 2, 4-21, 24 7	=	24 "
(For VII, 31 10, is substituted \III, 99, 1)		
6 Vāṅkṣā hymns	=	56 "
\I, 46, 3-14	=	12 "
III, 44	=	5 "
III 45	=	5 "

of the hymn, 'Sing of nought else' (RV, VIII, 1) He omits the seventh and eighth stanzas of the twenty stanzas beginning, 'Drink the fragrant Soma' (RV, VIII, 3, 1) (Then come) fourteen stanzas beginning, 'When, Indra, forward, backward, upward' (RV, VIII, 4, 1) Then fifteen stanzas beginning, 'We with the Soma thee' (RV, VIII, 33, 1) In the hymn, 'May not thee the sacrificers' (RV, VII, 32), he omits the *dupadā* (ibid, 3), and the *pragātha* connected with the Rathantara Sāman (ibid, 22) Further he omits the *pragātha*, 'No one Sudās' chariot' (ibid, 10), and inserts in its place the *pragātha*, 'Thee men but yesterday' (RV, VIII, 99, 1) (Then) six Vālakhilya hymns beginning, 'Him of good gifts' (RV, VIII, 49, 1) (Then) the rest (of the hymn, RV, VI, 45), beginning, 'Who active ever slays the foe' (ibid, 3) (Then) two hymns beginning, 'May this delightful one for thee' (RV, III, 44, 1) He omits the seventh and eighth stanzas of the hymn, 'Both let him hear' (RV, VIII, 61) He omits the last stanza of the hymn, 'With strength him that finds treasure' (RV, VIII, 66) (Then come) eleven stanzas beginning, 'Who is king of men' (RV, VIII, 70, 1) (Then the hymns), 'Him who works wonders, enduring the onslaught' (RV, VIII, 88), 'To be invoked by us in all' (RV, VIII, 90), and nine verses of the hymn, 'The blessings thou dost bear, Indra' (RV, VIII, 97). (Then comes) the *sūdadaha* verse.

RV, VIII, 61, 1-6, 9-18	= 16 verses
„ 66, 1-14	= 14 „
„ 70, 1-11	= 11 „
„ 88	= 6 „
„ 90	= 6 „
„ 97, 1-9	= 9 „
	<hr/>
	= 140 verses

Of these however, no less than 80 are *satabrhat* verses. In Śāṅkhyaṇa Śranta Sūtra, XVIII, B 11, the *śloka* is given as follows. VIII, 97, 1-9, VIII, 61, 7-9, 1, 36, 7, 8, VIII, 70, 7-12, = 20 *pratyakṣabrahats* then VI, 46, 3-10, VII, 32, 1, 2, 4-9, VII, 31, 12-21, VII, 32, 24-37, VIII, 1, 1-4, *ma n tva parvasa*, VIII, 3, 9-12, VIII, 3, 17-20, VIII, 4, 1-14, VIII, 61, 3-6, VIII, 61, 9-18, VIII, 66, 3-14. Hillebrandt in his index gives the references differently, but this is apparently due to a confusion between *pragāthas* and stanzas. There are really 43 *pragāthas*. The one *ma n, &c.* is not apparently from the Samhitā, Hillebrandt's indices all ignore it, and it does not appear in Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance*. Of the last six, three only are selected to make up the 40. Then come 20 more *pratyakṣabrahats*, VIII, 1, 5-24. Then 20 more VIII, 1, 25-29, VIII, 31, 1-15. Then 40 *pragāthas*, the three over the first 40, VIII, 70, 1-6, VIII, 88, 1, 2, VIII, 90, 1-6, VIII, 99, 1-8, VIII, 49-55 (the Vālakhilyas), omitting VIII, 53, 5, 6, 54, 3, 4. Then I, 175, 1, VI, 43, 4, III, 53, 18, VI, 47, 19, VIII, 78, 10, VIII, 89, 7, VIII, 101, 13, X, 102, 1, 3, 13, making 20 *brhat*, and III, 44, 43, making up 20 *ma* all. The whole *brahats* *śloka* consists therefore of 80 *brhat*s and 80 (not 160 as Friedländer) *pragāthas*, giving (80 + 80 =) 160 *brhat*s and 80 *satabrhat*s, just as in the Anāreya. Cf Śāṅkhyaṇa Anāreya, II, 8 and 9, for the *gāyatrī* and *brahats* *śloka*.

5 (Then come) the eighty *urnāś* tristichs.¹ There are the two hymns beginning, 'Indra who is the greatest drinker of the Soma' (RV., VIII, 12, 1). He omits the last stanza of the hymn, 'Sing forth to him' (RV., VIII, 15) (Then comes) the hymn, 'To Indra sing the *sāman*' (RV., VIII, 98) He omits the last three stanzas of the hymn, 'Let us utter, O comrades' (RV., VIII,

¹ There are—	RV, VIII, 12	= 33 stanzas.
	" 13	= 33 "
	" 15, 1-12	= 12 "
	" 98	= 12 "
	" 24, 1-27	= 27 "
	I, 84, 7-9	= 3 "
	V, 40, 1-3	= 3 "
	VI, 43, 1-3	= 3 "
		= 126 <i>urnāś</i> stanzas.

Then <i>gayatri</i> stanzas—	RV., VIII, 14	= 15 stanzas.
	" 16	= 15 "
	" 17, 1-15	= 15 "
	III, 37, 1-10	= 10 "
	I, 4	= 10 "
	" 5	= 10 "
	" 6	= 10 "
	" 8	= 10 "
	" 9	= 10 "
	VI, 45, 1-30	= 30 "
	I, 30, 13-15	= 3 "
		= 133 <i>gayatri</i> stanzas, or 114 <i>urnāś</i> stanzas
		making in all 240 <i>urnāś</i> .

According to Śaṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra the verses are RV, VIII 12 1-33, VIII, 12, 1-21, 25-33, VIII, 15, 1-12, VIII, 24, 1-27, I, 84, 7-9, V, 40, 1-3, = 36 *trcas* or 108 *urnāś* stanzas, XVIII, 12. Then, XVIII, 13, come RV, IV, 30, 1-6, IV, 30, 9-22, IV, 31, 1-22, I, 30, 1-15, VIII, 14, 1-15, VIII, 16, 1-12, VIII, 64, 1-22, VIII, 82, 1-9 (Hillebrandt's I, 30, 1-5, and VIII, 82, 1-7 are slips), making 104 *gayatri* stanzas. Then VIII, 21, 1-16, *kakubhāś pragāthas*, then VIII, 98, 1-22 in *urnāś*. We thus get 240 stanzas, consisting of 120 (108+12) *urnāś*, 104 *gayatri*, 8 *kakubhāś*, and 8 *satsbrāhatis* (i.e. VIII, 21, 1-16). The Śaṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 10, points out that to get 240 *urnāś* it is necessary to take away four syllables from each of the 8 *satsbrāhatis*, which with 160 *brāhatis* make up (V, 2, 4) the *brāhatis* *trcasāṁ*. Then the 8 *kakubhāś* give 8 *urnāś*, while the 8 *satsbrāhatis* yield each three, or 24 in all, sets of four syllables. Adding the 80 and the 24 we have 104 sets of four syllables, which added to the 24 *gayatri* give 104 *urnāś*, to which again must be added 120 *urnāś*, 8 *kakubhāś*, and 8 *urnāś*, left after the deduction of 24 syllables from each *satsbrāhātī*, making a grand total of 240 *urnāś*.

This complicated version, as Dr Friedlander points out, probably arises from an attempt to remedy the apparent inaccuracy of the Aitareya in permitting 80 *satsbrāhatis* in the *brāhatis* *trcasāṁ*. Its success is not obvious, and that the attempt should be made may fairly be reckoned a sign of lateness.

24, 1) Then three tristichs, 'Who alone bestowed' (RV, I, 84, 2), 'Come hither to what is pressed with stones' (RV, V, 40, 1), and, 'Under whose sway Śambara' (RV, VI, 43, 1) *Gāyatrī* verses become *usnik* verses by equalization. Every seven *gayatrīs* make six *usniks*. (Then come) the hymn beginning, 'If, Indra, I, like thee' (RV, VIII, 14, 1) and the two hymns beginning, 'The lord of men' (RV, VIII, 16, 1). He omits the last two stanzas of the second hymn. He omits the last stanza of the hymn, 'For the strength that slays Vṛtra' (RV, III, 37). (Then come) three hymns beginning, 'The doer of fair deeds to our aid' (RV, I, 4, 1). Then two hymns beginning, 'Indra, lasting wealth' (RV, I, 8, 1). He omits the last stanza of the hymn, 'Who has brought from afar' (RV, VI, 45). Then come three stanzas of the hymn beginning, 'Let splendid feasts be ours' (RV, I, 30, 13). (Then comes) the *sūdadahaś* verse. In the case of all these three sets of eighty tristichs, there is made a pause after the half stanza. The eighty tristichs are the food, and the *vaśa* verses are the stomach (of the bard). The *vaśa* hymn begins, 'Worthy of thee, O wealthy one' (RV, VIII, 46, 1), and ends 'Gainer, gainer of good' (ibid, 20). The verse, 'Giving wealth' (ibid, 15) is a *drupada*, and, 'Now then' (ibid) an *ekapada*. It ends with the verse, 'Of that milk yielder' (RV, VIII, 69, 3). (Then comes) the *sūdadahaś* verse.

¹ Cf. I, 5, 1. The explanation of the number 21 stanzas given by Sayana there and here is that the passage ends with verse 20 and the *sūdadahaś* verse makes up the 21. This view may be supported by the fact that the *sūdadahaś* verse is here set out with its *prasthā*. It is most probable that we should understand that the 21 stanzas are made up by the inclusion of the *sūdadahaś* verse and then that there follows again that verse in its usual capacity of separating the different parts of the whole. Sayana does not clearly appear thus to have taken it, but it seems most probably so, and the translation is based on this view.

Śaṅkṣayana in Aranyaka, II, 11, and Śrauta Sūtra XVIII, 14, takes the whole hymn, VIII, 46, as being used. The priority of the Altareya is evident as vv. 21-24 contain a *dānastuti* of Prihāśravaḥ. The same remark applies to the Śatapatha Brahmana, see Eggeling, *S B E*, XLII, 112.

It is worthy of note that an annotator in *S²* considers that Śāyana's explanation of the number 21 is inconsistent (this is not the case) and inaccurate. He argues that the 21 stanzas are made up by splitting ver. 15 into an *ekapadi* and a *drupadi*. This view is at first sight plausible but the mention here of these divisions is more probably due to an explanation of *pañcapadum* in I, 5, 1, and so Sayana there takes it. The other view is, however, accepted by Eggeling, *S B E*, XLIII, 112 n. 2, who points out that the version of the Mahadukṛta contained in MS Ind. Off. 1729 D gives ver. 15 as an *ekapada* and a *drupada*, which certainly tells against Sayana.

For *gayatrīs* and *usniks*, cf. *R̥gveda Prātiśākhya*, XVI, 120q, for *sampada*, Śāṅkṣayana Śrauta Sūtra, XV, 10, 5.

ADHYĀYA 3.

(Then come) the thigh (verses)¹ In the hymn, 'O Indra and Agni, ye two' (RV, VIII, 40), (he recites) the half-stanzas as *gāyatrī*,² but the second half of the second as an *anustubh*, up in the last stanza. The hymn, 'To thee, the mighty, the intoxicated one' (RV, X, 50), has *anuds* inserted. Between the two hymns, 'Who in the forest as it were has been set down' (RV, X, 29), and 'Who first is born, the wise one' (RV, II, 12), are³ inserted the hymn, 'Come hither standing on thy chariot-seat' (RV, III, 43), and the stanza, 'Wandering alone in the midst of many' (RV, X, 55, 5). As many decades⁴ of verses in *tristubh* and *jagati* addressed to Indra as they insert, after transforming them into *brhatis*, so many years may a man be fain to live beyond the normal life, at the rate of ten verses for a year⁵; or he need not do so. (Then come) the

¹ Cf I, 5, 1. The verses are RV, VIII, 40, 1-10, X, 50, 1-7, X, 29, 1-18; III, 43, 1-8; X, 55, 5, II, 12, 1-15, V, 178, 1-3, an *chapada*, I, 11, 1-8; VII, 23, 1-5; VII, 24, 1-4, 6, 8.

In Śākhāyana the *raśa* hymn is followed, XVIII, 13, by the *chapada*, I, 2, 2, above; then comes the *Ānandragha sukta*, VIII, 40. Then the *chapada*, RV, X, 167, 1, II, 21, 1-6; I, 84, 10, 12, VII, 31, 10-12, VI, 46, 1-3. Then the *anustubh samamṇaya*, RV, I, 10, 4-12, I, 11, 1-8, I, 84, 1-6, I, 72, 1-5, I, 176, 1-5, V, 35, 1-7, V, 33, 1, 2, V, 39, 1-4; VI, 44, 1-6, VIII, 34, 1-15, VIII, 63, 4, 6, VIII, 89, 5, 6, VIII, 98, V, 132. Then the *tristubhāśa*, RV, I, 32, VI, 25, II, 32, II, 14, III, 41, III, 46, III, 51, 4-6, IV, 16; VII, 24, VII, 23, VIII, 69, 12-15. See Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 16-20, Āranyaka, II, 12-15. These confused masses of verses show distinctly the later character of the Śākhāyana ritual. See also Śatapatha Brahmana, VIII, 6, 2, 3, where RV, X, 50, is called the spine, IX, 2, 1, 44, 3, 3, 19. In the last passage the *raśa* is given as 35 in Eggeeling (*S B E*, XLII, 223), which must be an error as there are only 33 verses. cf. introd., p. 36.

² The second verse is a *chapada* in *śaṅkara*. The first three feet make up a *gāyatrī*, that is, they are recited with a pause after the second foot and *om* after the third. The second four feet are recited as an *anustubh*, with a pause after the second and *om* after the fourth. The last is a *tristubh*, and it is recited by *śukla*, that is, a pause after the first foot and *om* after the second. The remaining ten verses are in *mahāśukla*, and therefore are each divided into two *gāyatrīs* for recitation. It is characteristic of the deliberate differences between Aitareya and Śākhāyana that the latter, XVIII, 16, divides ver. 2 into an *anustubh* and a *gāyatrī*, not *vice versa*.

³ That is, if one desires life (Sāyana). See n 5. For II, 55, 5, cf. Ludwig, *Agvāta*, III, 186, Hillebrandt, *Fed. Myth*, I, 465.

⁴ Cf I, 5, 2, n 6. Sāyana here renders *dalatī* as verses produced in the Saṃhitā, which is a collection of ten Mandalas. But the *dalatī* below certainly suggests that it means decades as probably in I, 5, 2.

⁵ This must be the meaning, and so Sāyana takes it. He, however, takes *na rā* as meaning that each *brhati* produces a year of life, contradicting the ten *brhatis* rule. This is not impossible, in which event he points out the insertion of the nine *tristubh* verses gives eleven *brhatis* or eleven years' longer life. But it is not natural, and it ignores *tristubh-jagatīm*, there being no *jagatis* in the nine verses, and therefore in accordance with the ordinary use

hymn, 'That steed impelled by the gods' (RV, X, 178), and the *ekajada*,⁶ 'Indra rules all' (Then comes) the *anustubh* hymn, 'All songs have caused Indra to grow' (RV, I, 11). Having recited the first half stanza of the first stanza of this hymn, he combines⁷ the first half-stanza of the second stanza with the second half-stanza (of the first stanza) (joining) quarter-stanza with quarter-stanza so as to make *anustubhs*. Up to the last stanza he combines every succeeding half stanza with the preceding. The rest are done in the usual way. (There are) six verses beginning, 'Drink, Indra, the Soma, let it gladden thee' (RV, VII, 23, 1). Having recited four verses of the hymn, 'Thy place, O Indra, is made on thy seat' (RV, VII, 24), and then joining⁸ the last stanza, he ends with the second last stanza. The Sastra finished,⁹ he mutters the *ukthasampad*. In the place of the *uktharirya* the *ukthadoha* is used.

2. 'Thou art the head of the world,' the essence of speech, the fire of breath,

of *na ta* in Āśvalayana (e.g. Śruti Sutra, VI, 5, 22), Śaṅkha's pupil,¹⁰ I take it to mean that, unless one is *ayukthama* one need not insert the verse. Cf. Sayana's note *yady ayukthamah syat tadanaṁ prakṛpet*, whence it appears that he did not regard the *avapana* as essential. He may be combining two differing previous comments. The idea is curiously inverted.

⁶ Not in the R̥gveda. See Samaveda I 456, *ṣaṣṭasapti* Samhitā XXXVI B, Āśvalayana Śruti Sutra, VIII, 2, 21, Śāmaśikṣā Brahmana, II, 6, 7, which all have *vīśatya vījāti*.

⁷ See I 5, 2, n 12. Śaṅkhyana XVIII 20, applies the same combination to the *udūrahmya* hymn RV, VII, 23. The first and last half stanzas in both cases are left unaltered. The other sets of four *pa* *sa* are treated as *anustubhs*.

⁸ For a formal definition of *paritāpa* see Āśvalayana Śruti Sutra, I, 2, 10.

⁹ In the Agnistoma the *prakti* the Niskeralya Śastra Eggeling, *J B E*, XXVI, 359 n, ends with a Mantra *uktham sacandriyopācraṇā* for Āśvalayana Śruti Sutra, V, 13 23 of which *uktham viśvadrāya* forms the *ukthasampad*, and the rest the *uktharirya*. The Hoir here recites the *sampad* but in the place of the *uktharirya* come the *ukthadoha* in the verses set out in V 3 2. For the *uktharirya* of V, 1 3, n 6. Haug, *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p 177. Eggeling *l c*, 372, n. Caland and Henry, *L Agnistoma*, p 233. Sayana ascribes the verses and formulae to a *śakha* *śara* as usual.

¹⁰ The rendering of these verses is very doubtful and I have mainly followed Sayana. The difficulty is increased by the fact that E has here no accents, and Pīṇḍralāla has apparently followed a most corrupt MS or has scattered accents at random. They do not occur in Śaṅkhyana. Both Rajendralāla and the Anandāśrama edition print the verses with stops only at *śrāvaṁ syāma pīṇḍatā dūhanam* (and in the former case also at *at*), as if they were prose. They seem clearly, however to be intended as verses and I have divided them into *paṇtis* with mixed *śrāvaṁ*. *Indra* may belong to the first verse, and other divisions are no doubt possible but the original metrical form of e.g. *śrāvaṁ syāma pīṇḍatā dūhanam* is certain. For similar cases of verse treated as prose cf. *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, I XIX, 25, 3 and 27 2 and 3 where *śakha* appears in prose form. In VIII, 27, 3 *śakha* is two syllables only.

¹¹ The Brhaddevitā IV, 139, in the 'B' recension mentions Āśvalayana, and though this may point to the verse being late, it may also be quite correct, since a pupil of Śaṅkha appears to have been the author of the Brhaddevitā, cf. Macdonell I xxiv and Uvāṣyana was ended by one of his oldest pupils.

the abode of mind, the entrance of the eye, the source of the ear, the resting place of the heart, thou art all (Thou art) Indra, the undying sacrifice, the ambrosia, the sky, right, truth, conquest, decision, the end of speech, the pervading, that which is beyond all, the light, the odder, the unanswerable, that which was before Thou art all,¹ speech, the water with the lightning that goes thither and returns,²

as elsewhere. A striking example of verse disguised as prose is the inscription on the Piprahva stupa, see Fleet, *J R A S.*, 1907, pp 111 sq. following, with minor differences, Thomas, *J R A S.*, 1906, pp 462 sq. In the Aitareya, II *et.* we have —

Asatrena ksatram jayate balena balam anuṣṭe |
yayartam vidvān brāhmanā satragrahaḥ purohitaḥ ||
śaśmas eśaḥ samjanāt samnikṣha śamanasūḥ |
jayantam vidvān brāhmanā satragrahaḥ purohitaḥ || 28 || 11 ||
śaśya raja mitram bhavati (2 syll) dvitentam apobadhāte |
jayantam vidvān brāhmanā eṣa ttagrahaḥ purohitaḥ |
śaśmal vidāḥ, &c., as above,

and in other places fragments of verse appear, as is only natural since gnomic sayings like them tend in all languages to become verse. The old character of these Ślokaś appears from their metrical form, and they may be compared with the verse cited from Śatapatha Brahmana, XI, 8, 4, 3, by Oldenberg (*S B E.*, XXX xix). Similar verses composed at later dates are found in the characteristic late metre in the Gṛhya Sūtras, quite freely (Oldenberg, I c, xxiv-xxvii), one being attributed (Āśvalayana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 7, 16) to Śaunaka and Ślokaś are recognised in the lists of compositions, e.g. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, II, 4, 20; IV, 2, 2, see Saeg, *Die Sagenstoffe des Rgveda*, pp 7 sq.

¹ Śāyana has *jayya jayya vidvān jād jāt furvam karamam ruṣam tat sarvam vīṣam*, and he explains *śāśyaś ardeś* as *utamedhamarūṣaś eṣ*.

² Śāyana is to be explained by Śāyana, and *śāśyaś* and *ardeś* probably go with *śaśyam*. In the Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brahmana, I, 9, 10, this passage from *Indraś amritam duhanam* appears, but in a different connexion and in an inferior perhaps secondary, form, which looks as if it were borrowed from the Āranyaka. The parallelism has escaped not only Oertel but also Bloomfield (*Vedic Concordance*). Quite irrelevantly appear the words (the *gṛyāś* as *brāhman* is the subject of discourse) *śaśyantam mamuvindraś śarmākṣetr amritam vjāmāṇo vacaḥ |* *bahur bhāyas sarvaś sarvasmad uttaram jyāḥ | śyam śaśyam vjāmam śrīnamam aśraś vjāmam | furvam sarvam sarvāś eṣ | sarvam idam aśi dhenuḥ finste śarag arvaś || 9 ||* *śaśyāśraśam kāmadvakṣaśaś jḍnasamāṇam cakṣurītram vakṣāśraśam manāś vjāmam* *śaśyām brāhmanāśraśam amuvindram sarvasamāṇam gubhāgam śrīhnyuśraśam śaśyamam* *śarmakṣetrām Indraśraśraśam śaśraśraśam agvādīśam amritam duhanam sarvam śmāś* *śaśam aśiśraśraśam* | Oertel renders, 'These are its names: Indra, action, imperishableness, the immortal, end of the firmament of speech, the manifold, the numerous, the all, the light higher than the all, righteousness, truth distinction decision which is not to be contradicted, the ancient all, all speech. This all also, [like] a cow, fattens hitherward, thitherward. She that milks immortality possessing individual oceans (I), possessing wish granting imperishableness, connected with breath possessing sight and hearing, superior by speech, permeated by the mind, having the heart as its point, apportioned to the Brahmanas, pleasant through food, having the rain as means of purification (I) cow-protecting higher than the earth, having penance as a body, having Varuna as an enclosure, having Indra as leader, possessing a thousand syllables, possessing ten thousand streams, flows in all directions unto all these worlds.' It

which yields milk and fattens* (Thou art) the eye, the ear, breath, that which is

should be noted that the MSS read *ṛiṣṭhānam*, a clear error for *ṛiṣṭyānam*, properly a perf part. middle of $\sqrt{\text{ṛiṣ}}$ (cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 809), a word elsewhere unknown but of interesting function (for *ḡ*, cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I 146), which is rendered very probable by the metre, *aprativagah* (C), *sā cakre rutram, ṛdayagram, brāhmaṇāḥ* *īram* (a), *āharitram* (R), *śikṛam* (C), *Varmapariyatanaṁ, duhanāḥ*. These readings confirm the *brāhmaṇāḥārīram* of the *Āraṇyaka* text. *Ṛdayagram* is no doubt a possible and an easy conjecture, but Sayana already had *ṛdayagram*, and its appearance here certainly shows that the tradition hardened to *ṛdayagram* at a very early date. *Annasubham* is tempting, but uncertain as Sayana read *annasubhā*. Cf *Śatapatha Brahmana*, IX, 5, 1, 12, *soṣantṛiṣam* for *Mantrayanya Samhita*, III, 7, 3, *soṣantṛiṣam*. So in *Atharvaveda* XIV, 1, 11, *īrāṣ* replaces RV, X, 85, 11, *īratram* quite wrongly (cf Whitney, *Translation*, p 742). I consider therefore that (especially in view of the accent) it is very likely that *annasubham* should be replaced. For *ṛdayagram* if it really is — *ṛdayagram* might be compared *Maṇḍāyari Upaniṣad*, VI, 25, *duḥṣarmadhāṁ* for *andham* (Blax Müller, *S B E*, XV, 1). But error of text is easy. *Vyvanānto vacāḥ* must, I think, be divided into *vṛṇā* and *antō vacāḥ*. The sense ascribed to *Indrasatṛiṣam* is possible, an *I* in *frejyestham* may mean (as in RV, AV, and TS) 'having India as its base'. *Varmapariyatanaṁ* may perhaps be right, but it is far from certain, and Sayana had *varunatayastanaṁ*, a more reconducte form (see n 13 on II, 4 3) than that in the *Brahmana*. The words *bahur dānyas* should be *bāhur dānyāḥ*. This example answers the query of Speyer, *Pedische und Sanskrit Syntax* § 122, n 2, as to whether the idiom 'sunder als suus' is Vedic as well as classic (his *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 351 3). The same phrase is found in V, 1, 8 in a *Mantra* passage, and in the parallel passage, *Saṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka* I, 8. Cf also such phrases as *dānu ca me dānyas ca me*, *Taittiriya Samhita* IV, 7 4, 2, *J R A S*, 1909.

The accents of the R edition are very incorrect. *Pseudocum* is quite impossible. In the case of the compounds R has *ṛdayagras*, *brāhmaṇāḥārīram* *śikṛapratram* *sāṭprbhāḥ* *īram*, *prīṣṭyūṣṭram*, *śāṭprbhāḥ*, *Indrayīṣṭham* *ayukṭīṣṭram*, *brāhmaṇāḥārīram*. *Vasīṣṭham* is supported by *varśāṇṛm* (RV), and *varśāṇṛm* (AV, **medhas*, AV Paup), *sāṭprbhāḥārīram* by the RV, *ayukṭīṣṭram* by analogy with *sāṭprbhāḥārīram*, etc., *śāṭprbhāḥ* and *brāhmaṇāḥārīram* depend on analogy. *Indrayīṣṭham* has abundant authority. *śāṭprbhāḥārīram* may be compared with *gūmagāḥ* (hV), but cf *grībhāḥ* (RV). *Sāṭprbhāḥārīram* and *sāṭprbhāḥārīram* are supported by usage (Macdonell, *Pedie Grammar* p 96. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, 4, 227 sq.), and *ṛdayagram* is probable (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1287 a, gives several examples of different accents, Wackernagel, pp 238 sq., decides for accent on the first member as usual in determinatives with adjectives at the end (for examples, cf p 233). On this analogy, *prīṣṭyūṣṭram* may be right or possibly we should read *prīṣṭyūṣṭram* as two words, but the gender of *apram* would be strange if it is a noun (mean ng either 'lower soma stone' (RV, AV, but cf *śāṭpr* Stud I, 108 sq.), or 'lower part of sacrificial post' (VS)), since there it is always *mase* (cf n 5). The accent on *śāṭprbhāḥārīram* must remain doubtful, but if it is a case of a post part, the accent should be on the first. None of these words have found their way into Wackernagel's lists.

For similar cases of double accent in MSS, cf Schiefelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rigveda*, pp 59, 49 (from B). Wackernagel, p 40, points out that in cases of compounds the *Atharvaveda*, XI and XX, *Śatapatha Brahmana*, *Taittiriya Āraṇyaka* and *Maṇḍāyari Upaniṣad* (he ignores this work) are very badly accented. His theory of accent (pp 40 sq.) lays stress on the fact that determinatives (save those with verbal second parts—other than forms in *tu*, *ti*) originally had the accent on the first part and only later on the second. The accents here must depend on some extent on (a) the validity of the theory, (b) the view as to the age of the *Āraṇyaka*.

* *ṛiṣṭyāṁ* as it stands spoils the construction, but may be right. Possibly it was originally

measured by truth, which is produced by speech, and proceeds from the mind, what is truth in the heart, and borne by Brahmins (Thou art) food and prosperity, purified by the rains, rich in cows, that beyond the earth,⁶ to which Varuna and Vāyu most resort, that which has for its body penance,⁷ has Indra as its mightiest which milks ambrosia, with a thousand streams and countless letters.⁸ These, O hymn, are thy powers, there are the powers of speech.⁹ With these for me now milk the great wealth of ambrosia. Prajāpati created this prayer, the essence of the Vedas. With it may I obtain all; let it win all desires greatly, Thou art *śūh*, *śūhuk*, and *śar*, the three, thou art the Veda.¹⁰ Milk, O prayer,¹¹ children for me. Life and breath milk for me. Cattle and folk milk for me. Prosperity and glory milk for me. The world (to come), splendour of renown, courage, prosperity in sacrifice, milk for me.¹² All this he makes the Adhvaryu repeat, if he does not know (the Mantras). Then being urged on to sacrifice (by the Adhvaryu, who says), 'Om,¹³ offer the Soma sanger of the hymn,'

paṇḍit (cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 716), the nom. of the participle, or *paṇḍitā*, reading *dhendh*. The Jaiminiya Upaniṣad *paṇḍit* may arise from a misreading of *ṣ* or *s*.

⁶ *Āthhagam* may mean 'prosperous cows', and *varidhapatram*, 'purifying by rains'. *Pythi vyuparṇa* is *yupasya mīlam* (Sayana). If this is correct (cf. n. 3), the next adjective may belong to it or to *idhastanu*, but it is much more likely to be merely — 'beyond the earth', as in the Jaiminiya Upaniṣad, which has *Varunapariyatanaḥ* and *annakubhāḥ*, 'pleased through food'.

⁷ Apparently we must follow Sayana and supply *munisatrayajataḥ* or something similar. The verses are late in character, and *idhastanu* might mean 'lean through penance', but the translation of Oriel 'having penance as a body' is at least as probable (cf. the accent). The *uṣṭha* is blindly praised.

⁸ *Dhānani* is taken as nom. neut. Sayana renders it as with *gotulam*. *Ayutakaram* is due, he says, to the fact that there are so many syllables in the *dahanaprukarana*, *zastānāḥ paritran* are *sahasradhāraḥ* (Tait. n. 3). Sāhkhya, 1, 2, 3, 1; Maitrayani Sāhkhya, 1, 1, 3. He takes *ayutakaram* and *sahasradhāraḥ* as accus. agreeing with *amṛtam*. They are perhaps more probably nominative.

⁹ Or, as Sayana, 'these sounds are thy powers.' Bloomfield (*1 edic. Concordance*, p. 300*) reads *uṣṭhāśūhāśarāḥ*. The other seems simpler. *uṣṭha* and *śar* are easily identified, or rather the latter lies at the base of the former. For *apṛṣṭam*, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 921, 925, 573 c, Delbrück *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 352, 353.

¹⁰ The conjecture *vedas* for *veda* is easy, but unnecessary, cf. § 11 on III, 2, 4, RV, II, 6, 7, I 45, 6, II, 3, 6, III, 14, 3, &c. See also Asvalayana Grhya Sutra, I, 15, 3 for *veda* 'if To take *traya*, &c., as a separate Mantra is wrong.

¹¹ Sayana takes *brahma* as accusative. I prefer to regard it as vocative, despite the apparent parallelism of the next sentences. For another neuter voc., cf. II 7, n. 1. Jāyayana Śrauta Sutra VII, 4, 13 has *prajāḥ me dhukṛta*, and also *djṛṇ me dhukṛta*, *śalāḥ me dhukṛta*. On the other hand Atharvaveda, X, 8, 25 has *adhok — brahma va śalāḥ ca*.

¹² Cf. V, 3, 3. The Adhvaryu utters the *prasta* twice, see Jāyayana Śrauta Sutra, I 5, 3 *ekakam prasta yajati*. See Sabharwal, *Agastya*, p. 58, for the phrase, and for the gen., Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 597 b, Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 260.

uttering the cry, 'We who sacrifice,' he offers sacrifice with the usual¹² (stanza), and holding back as it were his breath, repeats a secondary *rasat*¹³. The accompaniment of the *rasat* is described elsewhere¹⁴. The Adhvaryu brings up the vessel containing the libation and the (three) *aligrāhya* bowls¹⁵. As soon as he perceives the food, the Hotr descends from the swing towards the east¹⁶.

¹² RV, VII, 23, 1, see *Āvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, I, 15, 23 *pūṣa somam Indra mandam iteṣa jayjā*, and VII, 11, 27. For the *agūḥ*, see *ibid.* I, 5, 3, 4 *āgūḥ 3 āyadīr anuyajasyarjama* II 4 II *3 e 3 yajamāha ity agūḥ*. See also Hillebrandt, *Ritual Literature*, pp 191 sq. *Heu- und Vollmondopfer*, p 95, Eggeling, *S B E*, XLIV, 31, n 1.

¹³ *Anuvataḥ* is freely used as a compound verb in the *Antareya Brāhmaṇa* (I, 12, 4, &c.), *Āvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, and *Śākhāyana Śrauta Sūtra* and should be written as one word. *Vjanyajā* is rendered *utkrośam* *akṛto* by Sayana, who takes *ava* as *eva*. The reason for the expression *anuvataḥ* is given in Hillebrandt, *Ritual Literature* p 102, Eggeling, *S B E*, XXVI, 351, n 1. After the *yajya* the Hotr says: *deva 3 van 3 it* and *somay āgūḥ 3 it* 3 *van 3 rat*, thus making two *van 3 rat* cries. For the *vasat*, cf. *Āpastamba, Yajñaparibhāṣā*, 96 (*S B E*, XXV, 341). The words *somay āgūḥ 3 it* occur in *Antareya Brāhmaṇa*, III, 8, 4, 6 *Āvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, V, 2, 19, and the brevity of this passage is only explained by the fact (see the following note) that the writer clearly knew the *Āvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra* (cf. *Introd.*, p 19) of the relation of *Gṛhya Sūtra* and *Śrauta Sūtra* in the case of *Āvalāyana* and *Śākhāyana*. Oldenberg, who once thought the evidence was in favour of assigning the two *Sūtras* of *Śākhāyana* to different epochs, has now abandoned the attempt and leaves the question open (see *S B E*, XXV, 5, 6 XXV, xxxiv sq.), while I am inclined to think that there is no evidence worth counting against the traditional authorship in either case.

¹⁴ Cf. *Āvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, I, 5, 17 *rug eṣṭa sāha oja mayā prañiṣṇau ity rasat-karam uktoḥśṭi anumantṛayate*! This is a direct reference. Cf. also *Antareya Brāhmaṇa*, III, 8, 9 where it reads *ten anumantṛayate eva oja sāha oja mayā prañiṣṇau ity atman eva tad kṛta tacam* = *prañiṣṇau ca uktoḥśṭi sāt iṣṭa sarvagṛhāya*. The reference here might be supposed to be to the *Brāhmaṇa* passage and not to the *Śrauta Sūtra*, but the use of *anumantṛayam* and the mode of reference are hopelessly opposed to this view. The style of reference is reminiscent of *Āvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra*, I, 1, 1 *uktam eāśṭamukam grāhyam vakyimāh* which is a clear reference to the *Śrauta Sūtra*, and I think an assertion of the identity of authorship. It may be noted that, although Oldenberg (*S B E*, XXV, 158) clearly indicates that he has some novel view on the relations of *Sāṅkhya* and *Āvalāyana*, he does not (in *S B E*, XXV) carry out his promise of discussing the point, save that (*ibid.* p xxxv n 2) he alludes to the fact that *Āvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra*, II, 7, 16, quotes a *yajñegūḥ* by *Sāṅkhya*. This of course in no way contradicts the view of the relation as pupil and teacher reflected on the tradition of the *Kāthīśāritiśāra* and recorded in the most precise terms by *Śaṅkara*. The B version of the 1 *śhaddevatā*, which probably was composed by a pupil of *Sāṅkhya* distinctly quotes *Āvalāyana*, which suits the tradition admirably (p. 293, note*).

¹⁵ Cf. *Āvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra* VII, 3, 22, *śākhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, VII, 22, 20, *anuvadmanam āgūḥjāt*. They are drawn 'over and above' (ab) *Mahe, tad jāt*, *id.*, 235, Eggeling, *S B E*, XXVI, 402, n 4, XII, 6, n 1.

¹⁶ Cf. I, 2, 45 *Śākhāyana Āraṇyaka*, II, 17, *Śrauta Sūtra*, XVII, 21, 6, 7. For *yaṣṭi* *na* with *tot.*, cf. *Delbrück, Alindische Syntax* pp 191 sq., *Speyer, Indische und Sanskrit Syntax*, 41 197, 227. This case illustrates admirably the origin of the use in its relation of *ut* and the 2nd person, see also *Maitrīyaṇi Samhitā*, II 2, 7, II, 2, 9, *Taittirīya Samhitā* II 1, 2, 1, *J A S*, 1979.

Then they tie up the swing to the west that it may not slay the reciter when about to eat. For the Hotr eats seated on the place of the swing. Then the Hotr consumes the (libation in the) vessel with the words uttered in response,¹⁷ 'May speech, the deity, rejoice in the Soma,' 'May Soma, the King, shower life on me for my breath,' 'May my breath milk mightily all life' The third pressing (in this rite) is taken over¹⁸ from the last day of the Abhiplava rite, except as regards the hymn containing *nuśāḥ* addressed to the All-gods (RV, I, 89) In its place are inserted forty-one verses of the 'water' hymn of Dirghatamas, 'Of that noble grey sacrificer' (RV, I, 164) and the hymn *anobhadrīya* (RV, I, 89) The strophe and antistrophe of the Vaisvadeva Śāstra are taken over from the one day form¹⁹ (the Viśvaji) If the Yajñayajña Saman is omitted,²⁰

¹⁷ *Upar* term is explained by Sayana as *itaranyajñaparyākāṣa*, the word occurs often in Śākhayana Śrāuta Sūtra, but not in a parallel passage. Cf, however, XVIII, 1, 12: The verse *veg dāḥ (gustad) somasya tṛpyatu* is found in Vajasaneyi Samhita, VIII, 37, and elsewhere, Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance* p. 833^b *So me, &c.*, is a quasi-verse It is tempting to render *ayuh* = if it were a dative, 'may Soma ram on me for life for breath,' and it might possibly be so taken as the sentence is a Mantra and therefore not to be judged by the ordinary rules of prose (cf Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. viii) In that case *ayuhpranaya* would not be a *śaṭpurnā* compound, since 'the breath of life' is not in Sanskrit *ayuhprana*, not yet a *dārmā*, but rather a case in which the mere base is accepted as sufficient to denote the case relation when followed by a case form in a parallel word cf e.g. RV, I, 26, 9, where Max Müller would so render (see Oldenberg, *S B E*, XLVI, 15) *amṛta mārīyanam*, and see Pischel, *Vedische Studien* I 60 sq., 215 sq., Jacobs, *Gott gel. Anc.*, 1880, p. 855, Wachsmagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xvii, and II, 1, 157, who accepts this view of RV, I, 26, 9 Cf, however, Aitareya Brahmana I 6 on II, 14 where *saranyuḥ saranyutvāya* occurs. The gen is one of partitive force, cf Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 160, Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, p. 146 For loc with *at*, cf Aitareya Brahmana, VI, 3, 20 for acc. *caz.* in *Ind. Stud.*, IX 293

¹⁸ For the Abhiplava, see Āśvalayana Śrāuta Sūtra, VII, 6, Eggeling *S B E*, XLVI, 403 It has six days. The hymn referred to is RV, I, 89. cf Śākhayana Śrāuta Sūtra, XLIII, 21, 8 The hymn, RV, I, 164, 1, is called *śahā* also in Śākhayana Āranyaka, II, 18, and Śrāuta Sūtra, XLIII, 21, 7 It is of course derived from *v* 41, *gauri mīmāṣa śahīmā takṣati*, cf. also Eṅghaddevata IV, 41

¹⁹ The Vaisvadeva Śāstra begins therefore with RV, V, 82, 1-3, 4-6 The contents of it and the Agnimāruta are given in full in I, 5, 3, which explains the brevity with which they are here treated Śākhayana Śrāuta Sūtra, XLIII, 22 (cf Śākhayana Āranyaka, II, 18), gives the Śāstra as RV, V, 82, 1-3 4-6, IV, 53, I, 160, I, 161, I, 164 (the whole), and I, 89 with *nuśāḥ*, and V, 53 5, as a *paridhānya* *Anobhadrīya* is used as a name of I 89 also in Eṅghaddevata I, 20, 5, but Bloomfield (*Vedic Concordance* p. 169^b) does not cite this passage, which is earlier

²⁰ The Agnimāruta for the Śākhayana is given in detail in Śākhayana Śrāuta Sūtra, XLIII, 23, cf Āranyaka, II, 18 It consists of RV, III, 3, V, 55, the Yajñayajña or a substitute, VI, 48, not noted by Bloomfield (*Vedic Concordance*, p. 735^a) who omits also any reference to this passage, I, 241 If the Yajñayajña Saman is employed, the Agnimāruta Śāstra constitutes itself in the Aitareya thus RV, III, 3, I, 43 6, V, 45, VI, 48, 1 and 2, VII, 17, 11 and 12, I, 99, 1, 2, 9, 1, &c, the rest being as in the *prāṇā* (Śāyana) If the Jāṇā Saman is

then the strophe and antistrophe (in the Āgṇimāruta Śāstra) consist of the six stanzas beginning, 'O Agni, thy fame, thy strength' (RV, X, 140, 1) when the Iṇḍa Saman is employed (three stanzas being used). If more (than three) are used in this Saman, then so many are employed (in the Śāstra) as the antistrophe, beginning, 'Agni, for ourselves = it were' (RV., X, 21, 1). Thus is completed the Mahāvṛata and thus dry and the Agnistoma.²¹ At the proper time they should carry the swing to the bath, and burn together the seats.

3 No one² who has not been initiated should recite the Mahāvṛata, nor

used, then for the two *pragatkar*, VI, 48, 1 and 2, and VII, 17, 11 and 12, are substituted X, 140, 1-2, and 4-6 respectively, being the two parts of the Iṇḍa Saman. If, however, all the six stanzas (X, 140, 1-6) are used for the *sattriya*, then X, 21, 1-6, must form the *anuvāṇa*. So Śaṅkha yana, who gives further variations. For the Iṇḍa cf Oldenberg *Gott. gel. Anz.*, 1908 p 714.

²¹ The Mahāvṛata is a form of the Agnistoma and so in a sense the Agnistoma is finished. The utensils and the swing are both cleansed, while the *vedi* and the *śruti* are both consumed by fire. Śaṅkha yana Śrauta Sūtra XVIII, 24, develops the final close of the ceremony in some detail. The Āraṇyaka, II, 16, has *śed Agnistomam saristhale*. The burning points clearly to an original sun spell. The question, however, has recently been raised whether the use of fire = not merely peculiar, cf Fraser, *Adams, Atlas, Omis* p 151, n 4, Westermarck, *Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*, I, 56 n 3. The usual view is that both the burning and the waving of torches in such rites are intended to evoke heat by magic. Cf Warde Fowler, *Roman Festivals*, p 84.

² Sayana as usual, ignores the difficulties of this passage. (1) The words *ity eke* most probably refer to the whole passage (cf III 2, 4, n 2), because the very first prohibition contradicts the passage above V, 1, 5 n 5, when the case of an *adikṛta* Hotṛ is deliberately discussed. The sense then must be as Eggeling (*S B E*, XLIII, 367, n 1) takes it, that (1) no one but a *dikṛta* can recite, and even he only (2) if there is a *citragṇa*, and (3) a year long *sattri* and (4) not even he for another unless he be father or teacher. It may be noted that Śaṅkha yana Āraṇyaka, I 1, prohibits recitation to another, save in the case of *sattrins* and of a father and a teacher, which corresponds with the rule here, since *sattrins* of course are entitled to recite for one another. But *ibid*, I, 5 and Śrauta Sūtra XVII, 13, 6, regard a *citragṇa* as optional, perhaps a later idea (cf Weber, *Ind. Stud.* XIII, 217, n.). The rule of those here cited thus excludes the Mahāvṛata as anything but a *sattri*. Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVI, 1, 2, loc. cit. on an altar at the Mahāvṛata (Eggeling *S B E*, XLIII, 225, n 2). But it should be noted that this is inconsistent with the exception of the father and the teacher, for they could only be concerned—being *ex hypothesi* not *sattrins* = an *ekāha* or *akṛta* rite. Possibly however the view that one can recite for a father or teacher does not contemplate the case of an *ekāha* or *ekāha*, but means that in a *sattri* the sacrificer may carry out the sacrifice for the benefit of his father or teacher though they are not initiated and cannot take part themselves, this view I incline to think the most probable, despite Dr Friedlander's view (p 29, n 2). It cannot mean that, the teacher or father being *adikṛta*, the Hotṛ recited for them only, for in the Mahāvṛata all the *sattrins* equally obtain the benefits of the rite (cf Eggeling, *S B E*, XLIII, 225 n.), and therefore are forbidden to perform for others outside the circle of the initiated,² cf Śatapatha

² It may be noted that the prohibition of performing sacrifices by other than Brahmins is ascribed in the Śatapatha Brahmana, II, 3 1, 39 (cf Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, IV, 14 11, Max

should he recite it when there is no altar, nor should one recite it for another, nor if it does not last a year, so say some. Only one may recite it for a father or a teacher, for that is recited for oneself². (The only³ utterance (of the

Bṛhmana, IV, 5, 2, 12 and 13, X, 5, 2, 5. (2) Presumably for this reason Sayana renders the passage as equivalent to 'no one who is not *dīkṣita* should recite the Mahāvratā at another's sacrifice (i.e. an *akṣina* or *ekakṣa*) unless there is a *citragṇi*, or unless that other is a father or a teacher. His explanation is that the Mahāvratā is of three forms, *ekakṣa*, *akṣina*, and *sattra*. As in the *sattra*, the *yajamāna* and Hotṛ are identical, then the *dīkṣa* is automatic. In the other two rites the Hotṛ is not the *yajamāna*, and may be either *dīkṣita* or *adīkṣita*. In the Agnisoma, &c., if *svārthe* he is *dīkṣita* as these are Soma sacrifices (cf. Hillebrandt, *Relig. Literatur*, p. 125). If the sacrifice is not a Soma one then he is not. Only the *dīkṣita* can perform at a *parakīya mahāvratāharmā*, and he only if there is a *citragṇi*. But all this is very difficult and inconsistent. The *matamattara* sūtrye he takes as a separate prohibition confined to one school. But this seems less likely. (3) Max Müller, *S B E*, I, 265, 267, takes the passage thus: 'No one who is *adīkṣita*, uninitiated, should recite it for another person, nor should he do so, when the Mahāvratā is performed without (or with) an altar, or if it does not last one year'. But this hardly makes sense, since an *adīkṣita* can never recite if there is a *sattra*, and the construction of the sentence shows that the series of prohibitions is not directed to an *adīkṣita* but to a priest in general. He is not to recite if *adīkṣita*, nor if there is no fire, &c. Dr. Friedlander, on Śaṅkhayana Āranyaka, I, 1, follows Max Müller, without commenting on the difficulties. (4) The only other possibility is to render, 'No one who is not initiated must recite, nor must one recite if there is no fire, nor for another (i.e. allowing *akṣina* and *ekakṣa* if by chance the *yajamāna* is the Hotṛ in fact)'. Some say, 'nor if it be not a *sattra*. One may recite for a father, &c. In this case the passage confirms in part the view that there was probably a *citragṇi* at the *ekakṣa* and *akṣina* rites, Eggeling *S B E* XLIII, xxv.

² Śaṅkhayana Āranyaka, I, 1, has *atmano* *has* *asya* *tae* *chastam* *bhāra*ti. The one gives the body, the other learning. *Atmano* here is no doubt correct as less easy than *atmane*. It is a predicative possessive gen., as in I, 2, 2, 2. Cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 298, Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 64. For *asya*, cf. Caland, *Ueber das vi. Sutra des Bandh* pp. 44-45.

³ Savana says *atra* *bṛhad* *vāyuntaram* *adhijate*. This can hardly refer to recitation, and throws grave doubt on Winternitz's interpretation of a similar phrase in Haradatta (*Mantra-praśna* I, xiv). The passage is given in all the MSS., but it cannot be original. In addition to being quite out of place, it is almost unintelligible here. It is a general description of the *prasa* of the Adhvaryu in the case of Śastras, whether accompanied by *Āśvīdāmukhyacamanas* or not. In the case of the Hotṛ's Śastras the *prasa* is *uktā* a *yajamāna*. In the case of the Hotṛikas, what it is is disputed. Sayana says (1) some supply *uktā* *yajamāna* (cf. Satyayana Śrauta Sūtra, IX, 23-33 (*śamanīya*), 14, 22 (*śamanam*), Apastamba Śrauta Sūtra, XII, 27, 19 (*śamanīya*), 28, 24 (*śamanīya*)) and make this the *prasa*, (2) others, so 'yam *arthak* *prākrita* *etā* *prāpta* *itī* *mātra*, reject the passage, (3) others repeat *uktā* *yajamāna*, and assume the mention here is *hotṛāhnam* *lastrem* *vāśvīdāmukhyacamanam*. The second alternative is the most probable. The words *uktā*—*śamanam*, which appear in the text after *hotṛāhnam*, are certainly spurious and cannot have been read even by Sayana, whose note would be

Müller *S B E*, XXX, 321), to the fact that Brahmins only can eat the remains of a sacrifice. The reason is no doubt a reflex of the doctrine of the presence of the divinity in the sacrifice (which in certain cases forbids any eating whatever, e.g. *Āśvalay* *Śrauta Sūtra* IV, 8, 31), for which see my article in the *J. A. S.* 1907, pp. 939-94. 1. Oberlo *et* *of* *Soma*, I, 276-94.

Adhvaryu) on the Hotr's Śāstras, whether accompanied or not by libations for Naraśamsa, is 'Offer the Soma with the hymn', and it also occurs in the Hotraka's Śāstras) Thus day one should not teach to one who is not a regular pupil, and has not been so for a year, assuredly not to one who has not been so for 3 year, nor to one who is not a *brāhmacārin* and does not belong to the same school,⁴ assuredly not to one who does not belong to the same school, nor to one who has not come to that place.⁵ There should not be more than one saying or twice, twice only.⁶ 'One man should tell it to one,' says Jāṭikarnya. 'Not to a child or a man in the third stage of life'.⁷ Nor standing to one standing, nor walking to one walking, nor lying to one lying nor seated on a couch to one so seated, but seated on the ground to one so seated (should the teacher teach). Nor (should the pupil) lean backwards,⁸ nor forwards, nor be over clothed, nor adopt postures, but he should raise his knees, without wearing special apparel, and so learn. He should not learn when he has eaten flesh, or seen blood, or a dead body, or done what is unlawful, or anointed (his eyes) or oiled or rubbed his body, or had himself shaved, or bathed, or has put on colour, or put on a wreath, or had intercourse, or written,⁹ or obliterated

unintelligible if he had had them before him. The reason for these insertions is obvious. For the libations of *L. Agnistoma* p. 220. The gen. is presumably partitive, cf. *Speyer, Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 67. V 3, 2, n. 17.

⁴ Cf. Gautama Sūtra, XIV, 27, and Bühler's note in his translation (*S B E*, II), where he differentiates it from *śāśādhya*. Here, however, it is perhaps used in that usual sense.

⁵ Where the teacher lives. He is not to go to the pupil's house.

⁶ Because it is so sacred. According to Sayana, Jāṭikarnya insists on one lecture only to one person at a time, and the same teacher to avoid *sampradāya* *śūdrā*.

⁷ This sentence must also belong to Jāṭikarnya. This seems the proper way to interpret the *śr* which, however Sayana explains as *śrīyaprayuktanistadhavaprayatān*, and so Max Müller takes it. For the idea cf. *Manu*, VIII, 66, &c.

⁸ I.e. lean on a *kūḍi* (or a wall, &c., *Āpastamba Dharmasūtra*, I 2, 6, 17), or rest with his hands on a stick (on the ground *Āpastamba*, I c., 17). The other readings follow Sayana, who gives *nichchīdyakramana* for *navratyama akrānya*, cf. *Atvalayana Śrāuta Sūtra* XII 8, 19. For *śrīyān*, cf. *Manu*, VIII 23. *samastanga*. For *napatena karayitva* he has *nadhānīyānādi* cf. *Sāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra* VI, 1 6, and for the syntax, Dellmück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 124 sq. He takes *nadhān* as referring to the eyes. *Varnakānamūlīya* he refers to sandal or saffron being smeared on, for *varma* cf. *Bühler*, *Dact*, VI 24. For *onapātrita* *ibid.*, I, 41. For these rules, cf. *Āpastamba*, I, 2 6, 23-27.

⁹ These translations follow Sayana and Max Müller. Though they no longer 'seem to be the earliest mention of actual writing in Sanskrit literature', in view of the discoveries of Bühler, *Indische Paläographie* and *Ind. Stud.* III (1898), Hoernle, *J. A S B*, LXIX, pt 1, Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, ed. VII and others they are interesting. Writing on palm leaves may be more recent rather than on wood. The violent repugnance to writing shown here and elsewhere is certainly in favour of this view, accepted by Macdonell (*Sanskrit Literature*, p. 16) and Winternitz (*Gesch. der indisch. Lit.*, I, 29), that writing first came into use on the South Western Coast through commerce and that MSS. are later. For a different but very improbable view, cf. R. Shamasastry, *Ind. Ant.* 1906, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 426, 427.

writing. 'He should not finish learning this in one day,' says Jātukarnya. 'He should do so,' says Galava. 'He should finish all before the sets of eighty trisuchs, and resting¹⁰ in another place learn the rest,' says Āgurveśyayana. Where he learns this, he should learn nothing else, but where he learns something else he may at will learn this there also. He who does not study this does¹¹ not become a *śrutaka*, even though he study much else, yet if he study not this, he does not become a *śrutaka*. Nor should he forget this, even though he forgets something else, he should not forget this. Assuredly¹² never should he forget this. If he forget not this, let him know that it is enough for himself¹³. Let him know that truly it is enough¹⁴. He who knows this should not communicate¹⁵ nor dine nor amuse himself with one who knows this not.

Now¹⁶ we shall set forth the rules of study. When the old water about

¹⁰ *Śamayanaṇaḥ* is taken as *samajayan* by Śaṅkara, which is possible. I follow Max Müller on the passage as a whole, cf. Oldenberg *Prolegomena*, p. 193. On the form Āgurveśyayana, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1219. It occurs as a name of a grammarian in the Taittiriya Prātishukya XIV 32. Āgurveśya occurs in the Vāṁśas in Bhādarānyaka Upaniṣad, II 6, 2, and IV, 5, 2 in both Kāṇva and Mādhyandina Śāktas (Max Müller *S B E*, XV, 118, n. 1, 186, n.) Jātukarnya (the word is found in the *gana*, *gargodī*) occurs in the same passages with Galava. The spelling seems clearly Jatu⁹ though in Max Müller's translation the two forms Jatu⁹ and Jātū⁹ occur. Jātukarnya occurs in Śaṅkhayana Aranyaka VIII, 10 and frequently in the Śaṅkhayana Śrauta and Gṛhya Sūtras (III 30 1). Kātyāyana's Śrauta Sūtra the Vajrasaneyi Prātishukya, and in Kauṣṭaki Brahmana, XXVI 5. Galava is known to Nirukta IV, 3, Bhādarānyaka, II 6 3 IV, 5 3, Bhādderata, and Paṇini as a grammarian. see Max Müller *Āgveda Prātishukya* p. 6.

¹¹ 'Should not become' is Śaṅkara's version. Literally it must be 'is not a (true) *śrutaka*'. Cf. Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra I 2, 8, 27. The exact force of the optative is rather doubtful. It may be that it is the indefinite use of which examples undoubtedly occur in Sanskrit (cf. Speller, *Pedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 183 also in III 2, 1 n. 1 and *Introductio*, p. 61) or it may be an opt in protasis with the apod. in the indic. to denote the certainty of the result though the rule of similarity of mood is usually strictly observed in the older language. see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar* § 381 f. who enforces his rule partly by alterations in the text of the Māhātmya Samhita (see his review of v. Schroeder's ed., *P A O S* Oct. 1887) *J R A S*, 1909, p. 153.

¹² Śaṅkara says that this is read by some only. It is in all the MSS., but is an easy addition. Cf. n. 14. As here and above follows a negative sentence and is practically merely an emphatic negative as usual in classical Sanskrit, Speller *Pedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 340, *Sanskrit Syntax* § 402 R 1, cf. Caland, *Ueber das vierte Sutra des Baudh.*, p. 51.

¹³ Śaṅkara renders *purusarthaya* and Max Müller gives as possible 'for acquiring a knowledge of the self'. For the dat. cf. II 4 2. *Ātman* however is merely the ordinary reflexive. Speller, *Pedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 127, Delbrück *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 203 263.

¹⁴ Thus again Śaṅkara says, is read only by some and as it is one of those easy additions it cannot be accepted as genuine. Naturally a chapter of this kind lies open beyond others to such interpolations as this.

¹⁵ Śaṅkara, *vaśan. amulāḥṭa. va. vāśan. vāśan.* (*vaśan. vāśan. vāśan. vāśan. vāśan.*). The sense is probably 'enter into discussion with *vaśanā* and *vaśanā* here are clearly compounds of Wackernagel's *Altindische Grammatik* II, I 68.

¹⁶ Then come general rules for all Vedic study not for the Māhātmya alone. These are found both

the roots of the trees has been dried up,¹⁷ he should not study, nor in the forenoon,¹⁸ when the shadows meet, nor in the afternoon, nor when a thick cloud has risen; and when rain¹⁹ falls out of season he should stop his study of the Veda²⁰ for three nights, nor in this time²¹ should he tell tales, nor even

in Gṛhya and Dharma Sūtras (Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XXX, xxxiv, xxxv); Khādīra Gṛhya Sūtra, II, 11; cf. Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 8, VI, 1; Hillebrandt, *Ritual Literature*, p. 56 and ref.; Gobhila Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 3; Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra, I, 3, 9-11; Gautama Dharma Sūtra, XVI, with Bühler's notes.

¹⁷ The time after the full moon of Pausa, i.e. January-February is meant, cf. Weber, *Die vedischen Nachrichten von den Naratra*, II, 323 sq.; Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XXX, 77, n; Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra, I, 3, 9, 2, with Bühler's note, *Manu*, IV, 95; Yāgyavalkya, I, 142, 143. The four months after the full moon of Āśāḍha are forbidden in *śāṅkhāyana*, VI, 2, 1. The term is five months, beginning in the middle of Śravana, *Gautama Dharma Sūtra*, XVI, 1 sq.; of *Tratrasapada*, *Gobhila Gṛhya Sūtra*, III, 3, 1; *Khādīra Gṛhya Sūtra*, III, 2, 16. Śravana is also given by *Āśvalatya Gṛhya Sūtra*, III, 3, 2, 3; *Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra*, IV, 3, 1; *Pārāśara Gṛhya Sūtra*, II, 20, 2; *Hiranyakeśi Gṛhya Sūtra*, II, 18, 1. The *time upa nṛpita* is very unusual, but *upapurāṇa* would be almost equally strange, though not impossible. *Kāśodaka* is a curious expression, as explained by Śāyana. The separation of prefix and verb is (see Celand, *Ueber das vi. Sūtra des Boudh*, pp. 48, 49) rare in the late Sūtra style and is difficult to assume here, though this may be quoted from an older (metrical) text. *Upapurāṇa* seems elsewhere unknown in the sense 'somewhat (?) old'. Nothing is indeed more characteristic of the Vedic Sanskrit than the separation of particle and verb. Holtzmann (*Grammatisches aus dem Mahābhārata*, p. 48) says that the only example²² in the Epic occurs in a pseudo Vedic hymn to the A. viii, I, 3, 62: *druv adhi tūve vṛatāḥ*. Even the Bhāḍadevaī has no certain case of such separation. On Jacob's theories of the beginning of the year (*Festzug an Roth*, pp. 68-74), see Whitney, *J. A. O. S.*, XVI, lxxxv sq.; Bühler, *Ind. Ant.*, XXIII, 238-249 (dates of the commencement of Vedic study at p. 249). Thibaut, *ibid.*, XXIV, 85-100; Oldenberg *Z. D. M. G.*, L, 45: sq.

¹⁸ When study is permissible (hardly 'at any time' as Max Müller), he must not so study in the forenoon or afternoon, when shadows are meeting, i.e. he should begin at sunrise when the shadows first appear, and cease before sunset when they again disappear (Śāyana).

¹⁹ For the case of a cloud, cf. Āpastamba, I, 3, 21, 31. Rain out of season (*ibid.*, 27, *Manu*, III, 104, combines the two into a cloud out of the ordinary in the rains) is explained by Śāyana as rain falling in months other than Śravana and Bhāḍapada, August and September, or according to the *Sūptikāra*, under Nakṣatras other than the 13 from Ārdra to Jyesthā.

²⁰ The study of Vedāṅgas, like *vyākaraṇa*, is not prohibited (Śāyana). He adds *andvīdīḥ syethānāṁ trayodaśanākṣatrasūtramitāṁśaḥ śāyana vṛtikalāraṇam atkhyūṣṭya tato 'nyatra vṛttan saṁyam akāraśrīṁstamāṁśam tṛatradhīḥyānamāryānam echanti*.

²¹ *Arman* is vague. Śāyana gives either *atkiyamāṇaḥ sandhyāye* or *mahāvratadhīḥyānakoḥ*. The rendering 'at that time' of Max Müller is perhaps intended to refer to the *tṛatratras*, since the translation continues 'not even during the night, nor should he glory in his knowledge', since *ārya* seems to be taken with *ratras*. *Tṛatratras*, of course, includes days, so that the rendering is quite possible, though probably the first of Śāyana's alternatives is correct. For the acc., cf. Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 28 and ref. The note is one of separation, *ibid.*, § 33; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 283. The usual case is the abl., Speyer, § 32; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 446, who ignores this passage.

²² But cf. the warning as to Holtzmann's accuracy in Bühler, *Ind. Ant.*, XXIII, 246, and Winternitz's review there cited. In this case the fact seems substantially correct.

at night at this time be fair to set them forth²² 'This'²³ is the name of this great being. He who knows thus 'this' as the name of it, becomes *brahman*

²² The text reads *mayā ratrau ca na ca kīrtayiset* Sayana, followed by Max Müller, takes this as consisting of two sentences (1) *mayā ratrau ca*, (2) *na ca kīrtayiset* Sayana renders, (1) *kimatya mahavratasya jatham ratrau na kuryat*, (2) *kimca mahavratabhāṣā* 'ham ity evam janamadhye kīrtim aṣi nechet' Max Müller's version, which is much more probable, is cited above. But 'not even at night' would more properly be *na ratrau* (ana than *na ratrau ca* cf III, 1, 3 *natidyumne cana*. Further *kīrtayiset* is quite impossible. The form required is *akīrtayiset*, and no easier error than *ana akīrtayis* cf being changed to *ana ca kīrtayiset* can well be conceived. Then the whole must mean 'I think, "not even at night in this time (probably *adhyamane* *stadhyaye*) should one be fair to proclaim (sats)' The *adhyayana* takes place during the day (see above) and neither then nor even at night, when the *adhyayana* stops, is the telling of tales to be permitted. For the form *akīrtayiset*, an opt. desc. from a denominative (cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1036), see Whitney, § 1058. Such forms are very rare, hence the non-recognition of this case by the commentators. Cf also Aitareya Brahmana III, 30 *varā kīrtayisat* where Aufrecht (p. 430) proposes to read *ekakīrtayisat* (presumably by haplography for *varā ekakīrtayisat*), I, 24.5 *śulodhāyisat* (cf Leitch, *Jaini*, p. 32 n). Apastamba Śrauta Sutra VII, 24.5 *kūmakīrtayisat*, Kaṭhaka Smṛiti, VII 3 *pīpāyisat*, *Ind. Stud.*, IX, 264, Holtzmann, *Grammatische aus dem Mahābhārata*, p. 46.

²³ Sayana renders followed by Max Müller, "Thus, the *kīrtmadhyayarakṣyam mahavratasakṣyam* ru, thus learned (= *it*) is the name of the *paramātman*." He explains that the Veda produces *brahman* and so is identified with it and its sacred character resulting from this power causes the long list of *nyāyas* here given. This cannot be right. The word *śad* is the name of the *brahman*, see I 3. 4 where this is most expressly stated.

The end of the section renders it probable that it may be accepted as coming from Śaṅkara. Otherwise the passage would be suspect since it contains passages whose genuineness was doubted even before Sayana and the possibility of it all being an interpolation cannot be entirely excluded. The use of *brahman* is striking especially in the peed, and confirms the view that *brahman* is not to be found save on good grounds in any early texts. For Atharvaveda IV, 35.2, see Weber *Ind. Stud.* VII 134 for Maitrayani Saṁhitā, II, 9.1 see v. Schroeder, *Ind. Lit.*, p. 91, n. 1. Muir, *Texts* V, 373 finds him in Śatapatha Brahmana VI 3.6, 9 &c, but needlessly. Hopkins *Religion of India* p. 295, and Oldenberg *Buddha*, p. 30 n. 2, are vague. The *St. Petersburg Dr.*, I, 136, cites Taittiriya Brāhmana, II, 2, 17, 1, as the oldest passage, but Sayana's view may be wrong and none of the passages in Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 168 are necessarily so taken. He occurs, of course in the Taittiriya Āranyaka II, but that is not early, though its lateness has been needlessly exaggerated on insufficient grounds. Eggeling (cf *S. B. E.*, XLIV, 355) finds him nowhere in the comparatively late Śatapatha, though he appears in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad (cf Deussen *Phil. of the Upaniṣads*, pp. 172 sq.), and in the later Upaniṣads and in the earliest Buddhist texts, which however can only be doubtfully dated.

APPENDIX

ŚĀNKHĀYANA ĀRANYAKA VII-XV

THIS Appendix contains the text of Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, VII-XV, edited from the Berlin MS Orient, fol 630 (A)¹ and Bodleian MS Sansk n 2² (B). The Bodleian MS, which is at least 200 years old, save for ff 65 and 87 which were replaced in A.D. 1781, is extremely accurate on the whole, and the text which it presents is in most cases also supported by parallel readings in other Upanisads and Āranyakas. In many cases the old method of denoting the *e*, *ai*, *o*, *au* is retained, but not consistently, showing that the MS belongs to the period of transition to the new style. Frequent errors are (1) the reduction of double consonant to single, e.g. *tare dvisaniam*, XII, 20, (2) the insertion of a needless *h*, e.g. *sapatnaḥkṛtayanam*, XII, 19, this may be a mere graphical sign as apparently in the Manava Grhya Sūtra³, (3) haplography, e.g. *pramiye tar(d)*, XII, 20, hence probably *bhaviṣyati* for *bhaviṣyati* in IX, 7, (4) the writing of *ī* for *i*, e.g. *maricir*, VIII, 7. Many, though not all, of these errors have been corrected in a later hand, or sometimes by the first hand in the margin. The most serious source of error is probably omission, see e.g. VIII, 2, n 7, 4, n 3. As usual *cā* is written for *cā* in all cases,⁴ and *l* replaces *l*, I have restored *cā* and *l*. Further in the text is attached to the Rgveda, I have treated two verbal prefixes as each separate and accented, as usual in the text of the Rgveda⁵. Both MSS agree in several errors, e.g. the omission of *irayasya* and the reading *sicyet* (for *sicyeta*) in VIII, 2.

The following list gives the correspondence between the two texts of the Aitareya and the Śāṅkhāyana Āranyakas —

AITAREYA ĀRANYAKA	ŚĀNKHĀYANA ĀRANYAKA
Śanti verses (pp 75, 76)	VII 1
III, 1, 1	VII, 2
III 1, 2	VII, 3
—	VII, 4-7

¹ See Weber, *Berlin Catal*, II, 5. Keith *J P A S*, 1908 p 363, n 2.

² Described in Winternitz and Keith's *Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, pp 59-60. Purchased in 1886 for the Library through Dr Thibaut.

³ Kinnier, *Manava Grhya Sutra*, pp xxxv, xxxvi.

⁴ See above, p 10, n 2, Macdonell, *J R A S*, 1907 p 1105.

⁵ Macdonell *Vedic Grammar*, p 107.

hiḥ 1 sa ja enam etam samhitam tēdī samdhiyale prajāyā paśubhir jāsatā brah̥ṇa
tarcasena stargena lokena tartam ayur eti ॥ 5 ॥¹

¹ 6 A B. Not in Āitareya Aranyaka.

Prithivī purtarupam dyaus ultararupam kalah samhitah Radheyah 1 ity adhi
dattatam 1 athadhīatmam 1 tāk purtarupam mana ultararupam atma samhitā 1
sa ja enam etam samhitam tēdā samdhiyale prajāyā paśubhir jāsatā brahmatarcae
sena stargena lokena tartam ayur eti ॥ 6 ॥¹

¹ 7 A B. Not in Āitareya Aranyaka.

Vāk purtarupam mana ultararupam tīḥya samhitah Pauskarasadih 1 sa ja
evam etam samhitam tēdā samdhiyale prajāyā paśubhir jāsatā brahmatarcae
stargena lokena tartam ayur eti ॥ 7 ॥¹

¹ 8 A B. Not in Āitareya Aranyaka.

Athato 'nuyāharah 1 prano tamśa itī vīḥya 1 sa ja enam pranam tamśam
brūvan param upatodec chaknūvan kalac cen manyeta pranam tamśam samadhāḥ
prīnam tamśam samdhīstam² na laknoṣy āha³ pranas tva tamśo haṇyasyīti enam
brūyat 1 atha ced afaknūvan⁴ manyeta pranam tamśam samadhīstam tan naśakāḥ
samdhātum pranas tva tamśo haṇyasyīti evainam brūyat 1 jatha tu⁵ katha ca brūvan
tadbrūvan 1 a brūyat adhyāsam eva jat tat tatha syatī na tv evanyat kuśalad brahma
nam brūyat 1 atadyumna eva brahmanam brūyat 1 naḥdyumne cana⁶ brahmanam
brūvan namo 'nu brahmanebhya iva Śauratīro Māndukyaḥ ॥ 8 ॥⁷

¹ dhīstam B pr m samadhīstam B sec m. ² artha B. ³ afaknūvanam B sec m.
⁴ nu (1) A B. ⁵ a ca A B. ⁶ 9 A B. Sec A. areya Āranyaka III, 1, 4. head perhaps samadhām

Sa jadī prā am tamśam brūvantam param upatodec chaknūvantam cen manyeta
pranam¹ tamśam samadhīstam² prunam tamśam samdhīstam³ na laknoṣy āha⁴
prīnas tva tamśo haṇyasyīti enam brūyat 1 atha ced afaknūvantam manyeta pranam
tamśam samadhīstam tan naśakāḥ samdhātum pranas tva tamśo haṇyasyīti evainam
brūyat 1 jatha tu katha ca brūvantam tadbrūvantam 1 a brūyat adhyāsam eva jat
tat tatha syatī na tv anyat kuśalad brahmanam brūyat 1 atadyumna eva brahmanam
brūyat 1 naḥdyumne cana⁵ brahmanam brūvan namo 'stu⁶ brahmanebhya itī Saura
tīro Māndukyaḥ ॥ 9 ॥⁷

¹ pro A B. ² san aḥ tsatam B pr m. ³ satam B sec m. ⁴ artha B. ⁵ na ca A B.
⁶ Add B sec m. ⁷ 10 A B. Sec Āitareya Aranyaka III, 1, 4. The reading para for param
would improve the sense, though no version of 9 and 10 is satisfactory. Cf Āitareya Aranyaka
III, 1, 4 n 5.

Athato nīrḍhujapratadaḥ¹ 1 prithivyāśānam nīrḍhujam dīḥyāśānam prātrīnam
anīrākṣyāśānam udhājamātareṇa 1 sa ja enam² nīrḍhujam brūvan param upatodec
prithivīm dattatam arāḥ prithivī tād dattatam viśvāsyīti enam brūyat 1 atha jadī
prātrīnam brūvan param 1 paraded dīnam³ dīnam aro dyaus tād dattatam viśvāsyīti

enam brujāt i aha jady ubhayaṃantareṇa bruvan paratī upataded antarikṣam
 dātām aro nīrīkṣam ita dātāḥ sujalitī enam¹ brujāt i jad hi samāhūm
 tīrīṭyāt² lan nīrībhujasya rupam i aha jac chuddhe aksare abhīvyāharāt tat
 prairnnasjygra u evobhayaṃantareṇodbhajam vjagātām bhātāt³ i annaśyākama nīr
 bhujam brujāt svargakamāḥ prairnnam ubhayaṃakama ubhayaṃantareṇa i sa ja
 eman⁴ nīrībhujam bruvan param upataded acyosha atarabdhjam sīhanabdhjam ity
 enam brujāt i aha jady prairnnam bruvan param upataded acyosha ullarabdhjam
 sīhanabdhjam itī etānam brujāt i jac tu evobhayaṃantareṇaḥ tasya tasy
 opatadāḥ i jathu tu katha ca bruvan tabruvan ca brujād abhyātam etā jat tat
 tatha vjāt i na tu etāyat kusalad brahmanam brujāt i alidjyuma etā brahmanam
 brujāt i nālidjyume cana⁵ brahmanam brujm namo stu brahmanēbhya itī
 Sauratīro āsandukhyoḥ || 10 ||⁶

¹ nīrībhujāḥ⁷ A B ² etā i (m for ass m lated n) B. ³ Add B sec m ⁴ evānam A
 B pr m enim B sec m. ⁵ jantī tam B. ⁶ bhātāt B pr m ⁷ na ca A, B ⁸ 11 A, B
 See Antareya Aranyaka III 1 3 In the latter part *bruvanam* and *para* and *upatadā* for
bruvan param and *opatadā* seem essential giving the reasonable sense "if one is rebuking one
 who says the *nīrībhujā* the one (the latter) should say "Thou hast fallen from the two
 lower (*antra*) places." So in the case of the *prairnnam* the two upper places are referred to
 but in the case of the *ubhayaṃantareṇa* rebuke is impossible and no reply is suggested. It
 would really be more natural to put the words of the apodosis in the mouth of the rebuker
 but besides the difficulty of *atara* and *ullara* it is hardly possible that the section should give
 directions for turning persons who recite

Aha khalo akur nīrībhujatākītrāḥ i prvam evaksaram pīrtarupam ullaram
 ullararupam jakaratākarav¹ antareṇa sa samhiteḥ i sa ja evam etam samhīlūm
 veda samdhyaḥ prajāya pāmūh r jasata brahmanavarcasema svargena lokena sarvām
 ajur etī || 11 ||²

¹ kara n B pr m For the opposite case of XIII 1 a 5 ² 12 A B See Antareya
 Aranyaka III 1, 5

Aha etā tīyam brūmo nīrībhujatākītrāḥ sma itī ha smaha Hratvo āsand kējāḥ i
 p rām evaksaram purvarupam ullaram ullararupam tad jasoṃ matra puratī
 pōllararīṭe antareṇa yena samdhim tīrīṭyāt yena matramatram tībhujāḥ yena
 taratī¹ tarām tījyāpātī sa samhiteḥ i sa ja evam etam samhīlūm tēdā sam
 dhyaḥ prajāya pāmūhīr jasata brahmanavarcasema svargena lokena sarvām ajur
 etī || 12 ||²

¹ So A, B clearly The Antareya has *taratāram* ² 13 A B See Antareya Aranyaka III 1 5

Aha ha smasya pūtra aha madhyamah Pratyōdhīpūtro¹ āgādāhīnoḥ i pur am
 evaksaram purvarupam ullaram ullararupam tad jasoṃ matra samdhivjagātī
 sama tad bhātāt samavaham samhīlūm manjā² itī i tad etad vabdhyaḥ dīlūm i mā
 na tīrībhujā ye abhī druhās padē i nīramīno rīpato nnesu jagdīkūḥ i a āvānam ohaṭē
 11 trayo hrīdī i Brhaspale³ na parak satī no tīdīr itī ||⁴ sa ja etam etīm samhīlūm

veda samdhyate prajāya pasubhir jāśasa brahmatarccasena svargena lokena sarvam
ayur eti || 13 ||²

¹ Pratyedhi² B pr m, Pratyedhi in Atareya ³ svargate B ⁴ Brahmade B
⁵ =RV, II, 23, 16 ⁶ 14 A, B See Atareya Āranyaka, III, 1, 5

Vak pranena samdhyate ita Kauntharajah pranah patamanena pavamano
vitar detar itive detah svargena lokena svargo loko brahmana satpatarapara
samhita | ita ja etam etam ataraparam samhikam vedasam haiva ita prajāya
pasubhir jāśasa brahmatarccasena svargena lokena samdhyate jāśasāvarapara
samhita | ita jaḍi porena vopastatāh svēna taritēnabhiḥ jāśared abhiyajāharann etā
vidyād itam samhikagatā viduso detān abhiyajāharartham etam bhavijadity
etenavaraparena tāha haiva tad bhavati || 14 ||¹

² 15 A, B See Atareya Āranyaka, III, 1, 6

Ita purtarupam pititararupam prajā samhitei Bhargatah | tad etad ekam
eva¹ sarvam abhyānukiam | maia ca hy etidam pita ca prajā ca sartaṁ | sataditi
samhita² | aditir hy etidam sarvam jaḍ idam kimcid vītvaabhiyam | tad etad vcaabhyu
ditam | aditir dyaur aditir antarikṣam | aditir maia sa pita sa putrah | vīte dea
aditih paitca janah | aditir jalam aditir jantvam it ||³ sa ja etam etam samhikam
veda samdhyate prajāya pasubhir jāśasa brahmatarccasena svargena lokena sarvam
ayur eti || 15 ||⁴

¹ Pava D pr m ² "adit" B ³ =RV I, 89, 10 ⁴ 16 A, B Cf Atareya
Āranyaka, III, 1, 6

Jāya purvarupam pat r nitararupam putrah samhita relah samdhik prajananam
samdhanam it Sthavirah Sakasyah | saiva Prajapatiḥsamhita | ita ja etam etam
samhikam veda prajāyate prajāya pasubhir jāśasa brahmatarccasena svargena lokena
sartaṁ ayur eti || 16 ||¹

² 17 A B See Atareya Āranyaka, III 1, 6, Vienna Or Journ, XVIII, 274

Prajā purvarupam braddhotitararupam karma samhita saham samdhānam it
Kātyopah | saiva sahasamhita¹ | tad ahur jat² sahasamdhā deva it | ita ja etam
etam samhikam veda samdhyate prajāya pasubhir jāśasa brahmatarccasena svargena
lokena sartaṁ ayur eti || 17 ||³

¹ Saḥam² B pr m. The reference is not known to me. The epithet in Atharvaveda, VI,
6 19, 10. ³ ja B ⁴ 18 A, B Not in Atareya Āranyaka.

Ita samhitei Paitcalacandah | taca ita vedah¹ samdhyante² | taca chandam
taca mītram samdadhat | tad jātrataḍ adhite vā bhavate ita taci tadā prāno bhavati
vā tadā prānam relhi³ | tāha jat etapiti ita tumam va bhavati prāne tadā vag bhavati
pranas tadā vacam relhi ita anyo 'nyam relhah | tad etad vcaabhyuditam | ekah
suparnah ita samudram ā tiveda | ita idam ita am bhūvanam it caste | ita pakena

*brahṇa kāmaraṇḍi*¹ *kāmaraṇḍi bhāṭah etam haṇṭa sa sarveṣu bhūtesu kāmaraṇḍi*
kāmaraṇḍi bhāṭah ja etam tēda ja etam tēda || 22 ||²

॥ *Iṣṭy Āraṇyake sapṛaṇṇo*³ *dhyāyāḥ* ॥

¹ So A B see in *lauṅḍiṇyaḥ* pr m, but cf. Weber *Catal*, II 3 ² *haṇṭa* ca B marg
³ = RV, 1, 125 2 ⁴ *an* B ⁵ *ruṣi* A corr m B But the mass of B may be a
constructio ad sensum ⁶ 23 A B Not in *Āitareya Āraṇyaka*

ADHYĀYA VIII

Oni | *prano vaima itī ha smaḥa Śhetaṇṇak Sakalyāḥ* | *tad yatha śāṇṭambe*
sarve nṛjī tan śāḥ samahitāḥ yur etam etānasmā prane sarva atma samahitāḥ |
*śayāśayāṇmanāḥ prajā upmaruṇṇam aśhṇu sparṣarupam mayjanāḥ*¹ *śatārupam*
mumṣam lūhitaṁ ity etac caśurīḥam akṣararūpam itī | *trajāṁ tv eva na etat*
proktam itī ha smaḥa Hraṇṇo Māṇḍukyaḥ | *śayāśayā trajāya triniṣāḥ*² *śaṣṭi*
*śatāṁ bhāṇṇi samdhiṁ am triniṣat*³ *lani soṣṭavimśatisatam bhavanti sapṛaṇṇam*
śatīśatāṁ samvatsarasya horatranam tat samvatsarasya horatranṇy apnotī | *sa eva*
samvatsaratasammānas cakṣurmajāḥ śrotramajāḥ chandomajāḥ manomajāḥ tanmajā
almā | *sa ja etam etam samvatsaratasammānam cakṣurmajāṁ śrotramajāṁ chando-*
*majāṁ manomajāṁ tanmajāṁ*⁴ *almanam tēda samvatsarasya śayujām śalokātam*
sarīpatam sabhoktātam ānute putrī pasuman bhāṇṇi sarvāṁ aṣur etīy aṣya
runikṛjyo tēdajām cakre || 23 ||⁵

¹ *ḥ* om B ² *śr* *śitas* B ³ *tē* *majā* B corrected into *manajām* ⁴ See
Āitareya Āraṇyaka III 2 1

Attha Kāmṇharuṇḍi | *trini satīśatāṇy akṣaranam trini satīśatāṇy upmanam*¹
trini satīśatāṇi samdhiṁnam | *janṇy akṣarāṇy avocamahāṇi lani jan*² *usmano rairajās*³
*ta*⁴ *jan samdhiṁ avocamahorāṇnam itī samdhayāḥ* | *ity adhidāṇatam* | *attha*
dhyāṇam | *janṇy akṣarāṇy adhidāṇatam avocamatīḥni lāny adhyāṇam* | *jan*⁵
usmano dhidāṇatam avocama majā as itī dhyāṇam | *eva u ha vai sampratīprano*
*jan mayjāśad reṇo na itī*⁶ *pranad relataḥ siddhir aśh jad itī*⁷ *pranāḍ relataḥ*
trijet tat prjet na samdhātī | *jan samdhiṁ adhidāṇatam avocama partāṇi lāny*
adhyāṇam | *śayāśayā aśh nam*⁸ *mayjāṁ partāṇam itī pañcelāḥ caḥ arimīśacchāṇi*
*bhāṇṇi samdh nam pañcelat tad alīśasāṣṭram bhāṇṇi alīśasāṣṭram tarkatiro*⁹
brhāṇṇi alar aḥṇi samvatsarāṇi | *sa eva hāṣṭamāṇāḥ cakṣurmajāḥ śrotramajāḥ*
chandomajāḥ manomajāḥ tanmajā alma | *sa ja etam etad abhāṣṭamāṇam cakṣur-*
majāḥ śrotramajāḥ chandomajāḥ manomajāṁ tanmajāḥ almanam tēdāṇnam | *śayujām*
śalokātam sarīpatam sabhaktātam ānute putrī pasuman bhāṇṇi sarvāṁ aṣur etī || 24 ||¹⁰

¹ *us* *no* m B pr m ² *janṇy* *us* *an* *no* B pr m ³ *rairajās* B corr ⁴ *ta* m B pr m
⁵ *janṇy* m B pr m ⁶ *reṇo* B ⁷ Read probably *śayāśayāḥ* [*śayāṇy*]-*śīśāṇam* &c. as in
Āitareya Āraṇyaka III 2 2 ⁸ *bhāṣṭam* B pr m, corr to *bhāṣṭ* is which is clearly =
A *parṇi* *no* for *no* (*no*) *no* *no* as in *Āitareya Āraṇyaka* III 2 2 Weber *Catal* II 6 takes it
as a proper name The *fo* m is unique ⁹ *Om* B pr m ¹⁰ See *Āitareya Āraṇyaka* III 2 2

Cateḍrah putusa it Vatsyah i *surarapurusaḥ chandopuruso vedapuruso mahapurusa it* i *sarirapurusa it jam avocama ja eayam dāhika asma* i *layaslaya* 30 'yam *atarirah prajñātma*¹ sa *rasah* i *chandaḥpurusa it jam avocama jena vedan* *veda Rgedam Yajurvedam Sāmavedam it* i *layaslaya brahma rasas tasmad* *brahmistham brahmanam stuyam kurti* 30 *jajñasyoibham*² *vidyāt* i *mahapurusa* *it jam avocama sampāsara eva* i *layaslayasas*³ *aditya rasah* i *sa jat eayam* *atarirah prajñātma jat cāsav aditya ekam etad it* *vidyāt* i *tad etad vabhyu* *ditam* 11311⁴

¹ *atariraprajñātma* B
Aranyaka, III, 2, 3

² *oḍbham (?)* B pr m

³ *ay om.* B.

⁴ See Aitareya

Citram devanam ud agad anikam i *cakur Mūrtya Varuṇayogneh* i *apra* *dyatōprihita antarikṣam* i *surya asma jagatas lashtusā etu* 11¹ *etam evamutidham* *tamhitam samādhyamanam manya*² *it ha imaha Vatsyah* i *etam a hara bahirvā* *mahad³ukthe munusala etam agnō adhtaryava etam mahurāte chandoga etam* *asyam etam antarikṣo etam deya etam agnāv etam tājāv etam candramasy etam* *nakṣatreṣv etam aśv etam oḥadhitv etam sarveṣu bhūteṣv etam akṣareṣv eva*⁴ *brahmety upāsate* i *tad etad vabhyuditam* 11411⁵

¹ = RV, I 115 : ² *monya* A B ³ *maka* only B. The *ukthe* are supplied from A₁ and Aitareya Aranyaka, III, 2, 3 and are added in B in marg

⁴ See Aitareya Aranyaka, III, 2, 3

Ud tājām kamasas pari i *yohs fazjanla ullaram* i *decam deaira suryam* i *aganma yohr ullamam it* 11¹ *sa eva ksarasammānaḥ cakurmajāḥ śrotramajāḥ chando-* *majo manomajo tanmaja asma* i *sa ja evam etam aksarasammānam cakurmajam*² *śrotramajam chandomajam manomajam tanmajam almanam parasmai kamasat* *dugdhadoha*³ *asya vedu bhavaty abhago taci bhavaty abhago nukte*⁴ i *tad etad* *vabhyuditam* 11511⁵

¹ = RV, I 10 : 10 ² *is* B pr m ³ *dugdhā* B ⁴ *nakṣete* B pr m *nakṣe* i B sec. m. *nukte* must be right B has "bhago"

⁵ See Aitareya Aranyaka, III, 2, 3, 4

Yas tihya saccidam sakhayam i *na tasya vasy apt bhogo asti* i *jad im śrnoty* *alaham śrnoti*¹ i *na hi pra-cida sud-tasya pantham it* 11² *naśyānukte taci bhago astity* *eva tad aha* i *ten na*³ *parasma etid ahaḥ samten magnum cinnyān na mahatrakva* *stuyon naktid ulmano pr āya*⁴ *it i na yev eayam atarirah prajñātma jat cāsav* *aditya ekam etad it* *avocama hu jatra vīpradr̥ṣṭe* 11611⁵

¹ *śrnoti* B.

² = RV, X, 71, 6

³ *nak* B.

⁴ *āya* B.

⁵ See Aitareya Aranyaka, III, 2, 4.

Candramu vradityo dr̥ṣṭ ite na rakmayah pradurbhavantī loham dyaus bhavati *jatha manjstha t̥jastak payar bhavati sampareto nyātma na civam na jic̥tyasiti*¹ *vidyāt* i *sa jat karanyom manyeta tat kuryat* i *athasya adarṣe vedāke va jihmazasam*

vāṁśasam tatmānam paśyen na tū paśyet¹ tad apy etam eva vidyāt² | athāpi chidra³
 chāya bhataṭi na tū bhavati tad apy etam eva vidyāt | athāpi chidra nādiyo
 rathanaḥbhūṣṇa nābhāyeta⁴ tad apy etam eva vidyāt | athāpi nila nagnir dr̥ṣyeta⁵
 jalhā mayuragrīva mahāmeghe tū marīcar na paśyed anābhre vā vidyutam paśyet
 abhira enām na paśyet tad apy etam eva vidyāt | athāpy apidhāyāḥkṛmī upakṣeta
 jalraṭat taralākāṇṇa na paśyet tad apy etam eva vidyāt | athāpy⁶ apidhāya
 larnā upāṣita ja eso 'gner eva jalalāk śabdo rathasyaṣṭapādīs tam na⁷ jada
 śruṅyāt tad apy etam eva vidyāt | athāpi vāparjasye kanimike dr̥ṣyete dviṅṇāme⁸ vā
 na tū dr̥ṣyete tad apy etam eva vidyāt | sa ja 'to 'śruto 'mato 'upāṣito 'dr̥ṣito 'nādiṣto
 'ghuṣṭaḥ śrōṣa manū upāṣita dr̥ṣṭadeṣṭā ghoṣi⁹ | sari eṣām bhūkṣānām anīlara¹⁰ puruṣaḥ
 sa ma dīpeta vidyāt | sa ulkrāmann etasam aśarīram prajñātāmānam abhiraṁpadyaḥ
 vijahāsitaram dāhikam | sauṣṭa sarīrayaḥ taca upanīpat sarva hantemaḥ sarvayai
 vāca upanīpada unam tv etam¹¹ acakṣate || 7 ||¹²

¹ paśyati B ² paśyetad B ³ āpyet B pr m, text sec m, A, vs B ⁴ dr̥ṣyate B.
⁵ ita B clearly, cf XI, 3 n 2 ⁶ Here in the MS = now page, f 65, has taken the place
 of the original leaf of the MS. It is, however, in an old hand. ⁷ talra B, but no is
 implied in the abbreviated version of XI, 3 below, and inserted in Aitareya Āranyaka, III,
 2, 4 ⁸ jātiv A ⁹ roḥ A ¹⁰ sry add A ¹¹ Aitareya Āranyaka, III, 2, 4, 5.

Prthivyā rūpam sparśa anīlaksasojomāno divaḥ svarāḥ | Agne rūpam sparśa
 Vayor āsmāna Adityaya svarāḥ | Rgvedaya rūpam sparśa Yajurvedasyomānaḥ
 Samavedaya svarāḥ | rathantaraya rūpam sparśa Vāmadedasyomāno brhataḥ
 svarāḥ | pranaya rūpam sparśa apanasyomāno vjanaya svarāḥ | pranaya
 rūpam sparśa apanasyomāno manasaḥ svarāḥ | prānaya rūpam sparśa apanay-
 omāno udanaya svarāḥ svarā ite Punardattāḥ | eva u hanta sarvām vācam
 tida ja etam veda || 8 ||¹³

¹ 'deva' B.

² See Aitareya Āranyaka, III, 2, 5.

Attha khalv etam dantī tīnā bhavati tadā'aukṣṭir asau manur vīṇā bhavati |
 tad jātheyam śatīratasi tardmavasi bhavaty evam evāṣau śatīratasi tardmavasi
 bhavati | tad jāthasyaḥ śra evam amuṣyaḥ śīṣaḥ | tad jāthasyaḥ tamśa evam
 amuṣyā dandah | tad jāthasyā udaram etam amuṣya ambhāṇam | tad jāthasyaḥ
 mukhānāṁke akṣmī uly¹ evam amuṣyaḥ chidrām | tad jāthasyā angulimigrahā
 upasīlaraṇāmīty evam amuṣyāḥ parvam² | tad jāthasya aṅgulyaḥ evam amuṣyaḥ
 śantīrayaḥ | tad jāthasyaḥ jīhvanam amuṣyā vādanam | tad jāthasyāḥ para evam
 amuṣyāḥ svarāḥ | tad jāthā hanteyam romaṣeṇa carmanāpūṣitā bhavaty etam
 evāṣau romaṣeṇa carmanāpūṣitā bhavati | romaṣeṇa ha ima carmanā purā vīṇā
 apidadhātī | sauṣṭa dantī vīṇā bhavati | sa ja etam etam dantīm tīnām veda
 śrutatada' atamo³ bhavati bhūmiprasja⁴ kīrtir bha' it⁵ suśrūṣunte⁶ hāya parṣatsu

dhātyaanāṇasjedam astu yad ayaṁ ihate jatrūryā vāg vadatī¹ vidur enam
tatru ॥ 9 ॥²

¹ From f 66 on the old hand resumes

² abhīṇty B sec m.

³ aarāṇa A.

⁴ padmanāṇa B. ⁵ dhātva⁶ A, B. ⁷ dhāt B pr. m. ⁸ mātva⁹ B. ¹⁰ vadatī B. tācā
may be read, but see Śatapatha Brahmana, III, 2, 3, 15. ¹¹ See Antareya Āranyaka, III, 2, 5.

Athāta Tāndavindasya¹ vacaḥ | tad jatheyam akulaena vadayitrā vīṇā-
rabdhā na kṛtām vīṇārtham sādhaaty evam evākulena vaktṛā vāg ārabdhā
na kṛtām vāgartham sādhaaty | tad yathā harveyam kuśalena vadayitrā vīṇā-
rabdhā kṛtām vīṇārtham sādhaaty evam eva kuśalena vaktṛā vāg ārabdhā kṛtām
vāgartham sādhaaty | tasyai vā etasya vīṇāyā jā jvīṇā sā samhitā Kātyāyaniputro
Jālukarṇyāḥ | atha ha smatāt Kṛtābhārīto² brāhmaṇam svadāharat ॥ 10 ॥³

¹ vāndavasya B pr. m.

² So A, B, and Weber, Catal, II, 6. ॥ ॥ very probably an

error for Kṛtā⁴, Antareya Āranyaka, III, 2, 6. ⁵ See Antareya Āranyaka, III, 2, 6.

Prajāpatih prajāḥ sṛtvā vyasramata sa chandobhir ātmānam samadadhat¹ |
tad yac chandobhir ātmānam samadadhat² tasmāt samhitā | tasyai vā etasyai
samhitāyā nākūro balam jakūrah prāṇa ātmā samhitā | yaiśā³ ksudramitrā vikṛti
tānt nakhāni⁴ romaṇ vyāṇjandanti | su yo 'tra vicikitsat saṇakāram eva brūyād ṛte
nakāram itī saṇakāram eva brūyāt | etam eva jo 'tra vicikitsat saṇakāram eva brūyād
ṛte saṇakāram⁵ itī saṇakāram eva brūyāt | tau vā etau nakārasakārau vidvān anusam-
hitam vco 'dhīyīṣyāmyam itī vidyāt | evam eva vidyāt | atha vāg itihāsapurāṇam⁶
yac cānyai kimid brāhmī kṛtyevādhyāte tad apy evam eva vidyāt | te yad vāyam
anusamhitam vco dhīmahe yac ca āsāndukēyāyā adhyāyam prabrūmas tena no
nakārasakāra upāptāu itī ha smāha Hrasvo āsāndukēyah | atha yad vāyam anu-
samhitam vco 'dhīmahe yac ca svādhyāyam adhyāmahe tena no nāśāratakāra upāptāu
itī ha smāha Sthavirah Śākojyah | etad⁷ ha sma vai tad vidvāmsa āhuh Kāvaṛyāḥ⁸
kimarīthā vāyam yokyāmahe⁹ kimarīthā vāyam adhyāyamahe vācī hī prānam
juhāmāḥ prāṇe vācam yo hy eva prabhavaḥ sa evāpyaya itī | tā etāḥ samhitā
nānantevāṇe brūyān nāsamvatsaravāsine¹⁰ nābrahmocāriṇe nāvedavide nāpavaktra
stī ācūryā itī ācūryāḥ ॥ 11 ॥¹¹

॥ Ity Āranyake 'stamo 'dhyāyah ॥

¹ So A, B

² offhand A

³ nakāram A, B

⁴ āhāṇa⁵ B Both the MSS. have

brahmī Read perhaps brahmī ksātry evādhyāte ⁶ ta add B sec m. ⁷ āharavyah B sec. m.

⁸ kokyāmahe B pr. m. and for apyayāḥ below, apyayāḥ. ⁹ m add B pr. m. ¹⁰ See Antareya
Āranyaka, III, 2, 6

अध्यायः IX.

Om | tat Savitur vṛnāmahe | vāyam devasya dhyanam | śreṣṭhām sarvasāhātām |
turam dhagasya dhimahi

tat Savitur varenyam | bhargo devasya dhimahi |

dhīyo¹ jo mah pracedayāt ॥

adabdhām manā usitam cakṣuḥ ṁ suryo jṛṣṭam śreṣṭho dīkṣe mā mā hīn-
sīh ॥ 1 ॥¹

¹ dhīyo B see RV V 82 1 III 61 10

² Cf VII 1

Yo ha vai jyeṣṭham ca śreṣṭham ca tēda jyeṣṭhaś ca ha vai śreṣṭhaś ca stūṇām
bhātātīprano vai jyeṣṭhaś ca śreṣṭhaś ca jyo ha vai tasiṣṭhām tēda tasiṣṭho ha stānam
bhātātī tag vai tasiṣṭhā jyo ha vai praśeṣṭham tēda praśe ha tisthaśy asmimś ca¹
loke mutimūś ca² cakṣur ha praśiṣṭhā jyo ha vai sampadām tēda tam hasmai kamah
sampaśyante śreṣṭram ha ॥ ३ ॥ sampat jyo ha tē aśalanam tēdaśalano ha stānam
bhātātī mano va aśalanam ṁ atkā hemā detalāk Priyapatim pīṣaram śyābhrān
ho vai nāh³ śreṣṭha ite ṁ sa hotāca Prajupater jasmim tē ukraṇte karīram papūṣiham
itā manjēta sa vai śreṣṭha ite ॥ 2 ॥⁴

¹ prei ha sad asmim B ² ca add B sec m ³ na B. ⁴ I have kept this
enumeration though I (like ॥ II 1) is merely a Śānti as it is followed in the MS. See Chāndogya
Upaniṣad V 1 1-7 which has a parallel version with the better reading praśe ha tī thati

Sa ha tag uccakrama jaiho mukā azadantaś pranantīk prānena paśy mīśā
cakṣuśa śreṣṭhantīk śreṣṭhena dhīyānto manasātām ite ॥ 3 ॥

Cakṣur hoccakrama jathandha apāśyantiś pranantīk prānena tadantaś taca
śreṣṭhantīk śreṣṭhena dhīyānto manasātām ite ॥ 4 ॥

Śreṣṭram hoccakrama jaiho budhira dśreṣṭhantīk pranantīk prānena tadanto
taca paśyantiś cakṣuśa dhīyānto manasātām ite ॥ 5 ॥

Mano hoccakrama jaiho bālā amanasaś pranantīk prānena tadantaś taca
paśyantiś cakṣuśa dśreṣṭhantīk śreṣṭhantām ite ॥ 6 ॥

Prano hoccakrama jaiho tad jaiṣṭha saundhātāh sukṣāṇā padbhāfāmkṣa
samahhīdētām aśm prīmī samahhīdūt¹ ṁ ite ha samejocur² bhāgatam motkrāmīr
ite ṁ sa hotāca pranāh kīm mā³ annam bhāṣīyat ite ṁ jat kīmāṣī tēḥya pāśaku
nēḥya ite ṁ kīm mā taso bhāṣīyatitṣ opa ite hocuḥ ṁ tasm ad tū aśm aśīyan⁴
purasīac coparīśīac cadbhīh parīdadhātē ṁ lamdhūko⁵ hatya taso bhāṣīy annaṇo hī
bhāṣātē ṁ tad ha smantat Sahākan⁶ Jabalo Golrūtā⁷ tājyaghropādājoktī taca
aśy etām tūkātjā sīhantōh prabīr jāj jayaram aśya śakṭhā⁸ praroḥeyuḥ palāṣanūtē ṁ
tānāpātē tatāt aśe tīroḥetē dīyam mā līṣar antarekṣam mā mā kīmīr ite ha Tājha
vaikṣah⁹ ॥ 7 ॥

¹ I om ॥ sec m Above it has same² ² i om ॥ ³ kīmā and no at B
⁴ aśīya B and pari dadhātē as in Chāndogya Upaniṣad V 2 2 ⁵ lamdhūko B pr m
lamdhūko ॥ sec m anagnou B For a similar error (as for e) cf I 8 n 4 1, 3 n 1
These are due to the older mode of denoting the diphthongs ⁶ ca (f) add B. ⁷ In
Chāndogya Upaniṣad, 1 2 2 sq which is parallel to this passage there ॥ Golrūtāye which
may well be read here. ⁸ śakṭhā ap B pr m śakṭhā B sec m ⁹ See ॥ ājanāneyi
Sāṃhitā (which is here cited in terms) V 43 where for it is kēhīr ṁ and kē interchange
pass in MS and I prefer kē r (√h = √r) Also mī is only once used in antarekṣam &c.
Probably it is here a dīplograph

Atha yadī mahaj¹ jagamiset tirutram dilutva² ma. ājyām sartasadasya mantham dadhimadhuḥhām upamanthyāgnim upasamadha³ a parisamuhya paristirja⁴ a parjuktasya daksinam jano aṇṇottarale⁵ gneḥ kamse mantham kṛita hutva homan manthe sampalam anayet | jyesthāya śreṣṭhāya svāhety agnau hutva manthe³ sampalam anayet | prastishayaz svāhety agnau hutvā manthe sampalam anayet | sampade svāhety agnau hutva manthe sampalam anayet | tat Savitur tarenṇyam itī poechoḥ pratyā tat Savitur virmaha itī pachea acūmati mahajyāhritobhiḥ caturtham nurniyya⁴ kamjyam carmanā vā sṥhandile vā samvidate | sa yadī śtriyam pāhyet samrddham harmeti vudyāt samrddham harmeti vudyāt || 8 ||

|| Ity Aranyake navamo 'dhyāyah ||

¹ yadī mahamiset B pr m, text marg ² dilutva B ³ mantham B A has *gyar* śhyaya śrautḥyaya ⁴ nurniyya B possibly an error (cf XI, 3, n 1) for *nirnyya*, an irregular strong gerund (cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 991 b) The parallel, Chandogya, V, 2, 8, has *nirnyya* The words *mahajyāhritobhiḥ caturtham* ('m B) no doubt mean 'accompanying the fourth act with the three words *āhur bhūvas soar*', as would be needed in the case of the first RV verse, which has only three Padas

ADHYĀYA X.

Om | athato 'dhyatmikaṁ āntaram agnihotrām ity ācātsate | etā ha vai devatāḥ purnā mā prastishia agnir iate iayub prana adityaḥ cakṣus¹ candrāma manasā dīśaḥ śrotra apo relas | itān ha vai sarvasu hūlam bhavati ya evam vidvān ātmā ca pibati caśayati ca payajati ca | so śnātī sa pibati sa śrjyati sa tarpajati || 1 ||

¹ cakṣus B

So śrjīto vasam tarpayati vak śrjagnum tarpayaty agnir śrjītaḥ prthivim tarpayati prthivi śrjīto yat kmcid prthivyapikulam | bhavad bhaviṇyad bhūtam tat sarvam tarpayati ya evam vidvān ātmā ca pibati caśayati ca payajati ca | so śnātī sa pibati sa śrjyati sa tarpayati || 2 ||

So śrjītaḥ pranam tarpayati pranaś śrjīto nayam tarpayati nayas śrjīto nāśam tarpayaty akāśas śrjīto yat kamcakakemapekṣitam | bhavad bhaviṇyad bhūtam tat sarvam tarpayati ya evam vidvān ātmā ca pibati caśayati ca payajati ca | so śnātī sa pibati sa śrjyati sa tarpayati || 3 ||

So śrjītas cakṣus tarpayati cakṣus śrjītas adityam tarpayaty adityas śrjīto divam tarpayati dyaus śrjīto yat kmcid divāpikṣitam | bhavad bhaviṇyad bhūtam tat sarvam tarpayati ya evam vidvān ātmā ca pibati caśayati ca payajati ca | so śnātī sa pibati sa śrjyati sa tarpayati || 4 ||

So śrjīto manas tarpayati manas śrjītas candramasam tarpayati candramas śrjīto nakṣatram tarpayati nakṣatram śrjītas māsam tarpayanti masas śrjītas ardhamaśas tarpayanti ardhamaśas śrjī | ahoratre tarpayanti ahoratre śrjīto rāsum

tarpayati¹ vīṇas tṛpīś samvatsaram tarpayanti savatsaras tṛpī jai kimcid
samtatsarenopihitam | bhataś bhavīyad bhutam tat sarvām tarpayati ja etam vidvan
āśnati ca pibati caśayati ca payajati ca | so śnati sa pibati sa tṛpīti sa tarpayati || 5 ||

¹ tarpayati B.

Sa tṛpīś śrotram tarpayati śrotram tṛpīś dikas tarpayati dikas tṛpīś avantara
dikas tarpayanti avantaradikas tṛpīś jai kṛmāvantaradigbhir apihitam | bhataś
bhavīyad bhutam tat sarvām tarpayati ja etam vidvan āśnati ca pibati caśayati
ca payajati ca | so śnati sa pibati sa tṛpīti sa tarpayati || 6 ||

Sa tṛpīś relas tarpayati relas tṛpīś apas tarpayati apas tṛpīś nadims tarpa
yanti nadyaś tṛpīś samudram tarpayanti samudro tṛpīś jai kimcid samudrenāpi
hitam | bhataś bhavīyad bhutam tat sarvām tarpayati ja etam vidvan āśnati ca
pibati caśayati ca payajati ca | so śnati sa pibati sa tṛpīti sa tarpayati || 7 ||

Sa tṛpīś tad itad vairajam daśavidham agnīhotram bhavati | tasya prāna
evahataniyo paṇo garhapaṇo vyāṇo pūṣharyapacāno mano dhūmo manyur arcir
danta angarāś braddha pāyo rak samit sajam ahniś prajñatma sa rasaś¹ |
tad etad vairajam daśavidham agnīhotram hutam bhavati | roṣoḥjyam roṣoḥjyam
adhyarūṣam² abhī svargam lokam gomayati ja etam vidvan āśnati ca pibati
caśayati ca payajati ca | eīha ja idam avidvan agnīhotram juhoti jathangaran³
apohya bhāsmāni hutam tadṛk tatṛk tadṛk tat jyat⁴ || 8 ||

|| Ity Aranyake daśamo dhyaśaś ||

¹ prajñatm aś B sa om A

² So A ³ ruiṣam B

⁴ yatṛa ang² B

¹ tadṛk tasya tadṛk tatṛk B

² For X a B cf Chandogya Upaniṣad V 19-24

ADHYAYA XI

Prajapatis va imam puruṣam udatīcat¹ | tasmim ekā devatā avetajad vācy
agnim prane tasyam apāne vidyuta udāne parjanyaṁ cakṣusy adityam manas
candramasam śrotri diśaś sarire pṛthivīm relasy apo bala indram manyav īṣanam
|| rādhany akāśam ātmāni brahma | sa jatha mahān amṛtākumdhāś² pṛṇamānas
tūlhiś evam haviṣa sa tūlhiṣau | atha hema devatā ityam cakṛire kim aṣ am aśmadhiś
puruṣaś³ karisyati kim va tasyam⁴ anena | hanīsmāc ckarirad utkrāmameśi |
ta hockakramuḥ | atha hedam śarīram vīkīam va parīśutiram⁵ | ta hekīam cakṛe
Prajapatiś randhrya na ksamam⁶ hanīham ima aśanayapīpasādhyaṁ upatṛy⁷
ih | ta hōpatasye⁸ | ta hōpat taś⁹ sukham alābhamānu imam eva puruṣam pūnah
pratyavivīś || 1 ||

¹ adomēta A B and cf Weber Catal. II 6 text Cowell a MS B

² amṛtaś B

a common error e g XI 4 n 2 The reference is to the swelling of the soma.

³ kim

ins. B pr m ⁴ manyam B pr m corr marg

⁵ So B from √hr and affix ita (cf

Whitney Sanskrit Grammar § 2183 c)

⁶ mah am A B. I take śarīram as the subject.

na śhaksam (n for h) is at it eas er to conjecture but is less plausible

⁷ apo rje B. For

the perf cf Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, I 3 21 VI 4 2

⁸ pī B.

Vāṁ mamety aṅgīr avitṛṣā | prāno mameti rajar avitṛṣā | apāno mameti vidyuta¹
 avitṛṣuh | udāno mameti parjanya āvitṛṣa | cakṣur mamety aditya avitṛṣa | mano
 mameti candraṁ avitṛṣa | śrotram asmakam ite diśa ajivīṣuh | śarīram mameti
 prthivy avitṛṣa | rito 'smakam ity apa avitṛṣuh | bālam mameśvara avitṛṣa | manjur
 mameśvara avitṛṣa | mūrḍha mamety akāśa avitṛṣa | ātmā mameti brāhmaṇavitṛṣa |
 sa jathā mahān urkṣa urdra upasiṣṭamulāś īśhēd evam hūva sa īśhātā || 2 ||

¹ vidyuta B van^o A (as in XI, 1), but avitṛṣa The verb is clearly wrong of XI §

Athāyam parusāḥ pratyān¹ parā samvatsarāḥ samvatsarasya dr̥ṣṭiḥ paśyati |
 chandrā chāya bhavati na ca bhavati | mahameghe va mariciḥ va paśyed anobhre
 vidyutam paśyed obhira enam na paśyati | ātmu va apidhaya varasakān² va na
 paśyati | karnau vapidhayaopaddam va na śreṇi | natmi loka ramate natnam
 manāś chandayati³ | ite prajākṣadārśanam || 3 ||

¹ prastāyan B read perhaps the usual preyon of Wachsmagel *Altindische Grammatik*,
 I, 320 321 and IX 8, n 4 A has vidyutā below ² daruṣam B, see VIII 7, n 5;
 which passage is parallel ³ chandayati B

Atha śarpnāḥ | puruṣam kṛṣnam kṛṣnadantam paśyati sa enam hanī varaha
 enam hanī marikāśa enam hanī bṛāṇi khādāyati sūzarnam bhukṣayitva¹ vagiraty
 ekapāṇḍarikam² dharayati gam savatṣam dakṣinamukhe nalaḍamāḥ vṛjayati | sa
 ja eteṣam kimeṣi³ paśyati panduradarśanam kalim⁴ śrīyam muktakēṣam mundam
 śailādhyangarā⁵ kausamōbhārīrīdhamam gilany upararohanam dakṣinātagamanadīni⁶
 tiskṛjopāya payatam sīhāpākam śrapayitva sarupavotsraya goḥ payasi na tv eva
 tu kṛṣṇaḥ agniḥ upasamadhaya parusamukhya paritirya paryuktya dakṣinam
 janu aya sruteṇajāhulīr juhoṣi || 4 ||

¹ bhakṣayitva B corr to mag in bhakṣay² ² ekāś A B ³ kṣay at corr in B but see
 A tateya Āṇyaka III 2 4. ⁴ kaṇḍam B ⁵ ādyangarā A B Or śailādhyangarā⁶
 may be read. ⁶ Text doubtful B has dakṣinātagamanadīni the intermediate letters are
 obscure and have been corrected in a later hand A has 'aśa' ⁷ See VIII 7

Vaci me gñiḥ pratisthītaḥ svaha | prane me vajuh pratisthītaḥ svaha | apāne
 me vidyūvāḥ¹ pratisthītaḥ svaha | udane me parjanyaḥ pratisthītaḥ svaha | cakṣuḥ
 me adityaḥ pratisthītaḥ svaha | manas me candraṁ pratisthītaḥ svaha | śrotre
 me diśaḥ pratisthītaḥ svaha | śarīre me prthivyā pratisthītaḥ svaha | ritoḥ me apaḥ
 pratisthītaḥ svaha | bāle me indraḥ pratisthītaḥ svaha | manjau me śānāḥ pra-
 tisthītaḥ svaha | mūrḍham me akāśaḥ pratisthītaḥ svaha | ātmā me brāhma
 pratisthītam svachit | athaulad aṅgīrāśam sīhāpāke samataniṁ² sīhāpākayō
 paghatam juhoṣi || 5 ||

¹ vidyūvāḥ pratisthītaḥ A

² aya B The root is samatani

Vaci me gñiḥ pratisthīto agnē hrdaye hrdayam ātmāśaśaḥ samatani

maham¹ akāmo marīṣamy annatan annado bhūṣam sūhaḥ | prane me tasyāḥ
 pratisthito prano hrdaye hrdayam ātmani tat sahyam devanam maham akāmo
 marīṣamy annatan annado bhūṣam sūhaḥ | apane me vidhūṣaḥ pratisthita²
 apano hrdaye hrdayam ātmani tat sahyam devanam maham akāmo marīṣamy
 annatan annado bhūṣam sūhaḥ | udane me parjanyak pratisthita udanam hrdaye
 hrdayam ātmani tat sahyam devanam maham akāmo marīṣamy annatan annado
 bhūṣam sūhaḥ | cakṣuḥ me adṛṣṭaḥ pratisthita cakṣur hrdaye hrdayam³ ātmani
 tat sahyam devanam maham akāmo marīṣamy annatan annado bhūṣam sūhaḥ |
 manasi me cāndramah pratisthito mano hrdaye hrdayam ātmani tat sahyam devanam
 maham akāmo marīṣamy annatan annado bhūṣam sūhaḥ | śrotre me dīśaḥ
 pratisthita dīśo hrdaye hrdayam ātmani tat sahyam devanam maham akāmo
 marīṣamy annatan annado bhūṣam sūhaḥ | śarīre me prithuḥ pratisthita prithuḥ
 hrdaye hrdayam ātmani tat sahyam devanam maham akāmo marīṣamy annatan
 annado bhūṣam sūhaḥ | bale me indraḥ pratisthito balaḥ hrdaye hrdayam ātmani
 tat sahyam devanam maham akāmo marīṣamy annatan annado bhūṣam sūhaḥ |
 manyau me usanaḥ pratisthito manyuḥ hrdaye hrdayam ātmani tat sahyam devanam
 maham akāmo marīṣamy annatan annado bhūṣam sūhaḥ | mūrdhani me akāśaḥ
 pratisthito mūrdha hrdaye hrdayam ātmani tat sahyam devanam maham akāmo
 marīṣamy annatan annado bhūṣam sūhaḥ | ātmani me brahma pratisthita
 ātma hrdaye⁴ hrdayam ātmani tat sahyam devanam maham akāmo marīṣamy
 annatan annado bhūṣam sūhaḥ | ātmanā me ātmanā pratisthita ātmanā
 sāmānīyā juhōti || 6 ||

¹ So clearly A B ² var² A ³ pratisthito A, B ⁴ Henceforth the acc. be. of B abbreviates
 to hrdaye hā ⁵ Even here the abbreviation is meant

Ātmā jagatam aśvaḥ brahmadhām loham aśvadhām sisam kakudham rajalam
 śarajam sutarnam gajatram annam tarajam¹ īrṣīr amuśubham naham
 samrojjam Brhaspatir dardham Brahma panktam Prayapatir atchandasam Savitṛ
 sartaśudaci andasena chandasah || 7 ||

¹ rojjam B.

Ātme a śīro tāsāṃ jagatena chandīśa | furuso manik pranaḥ sutram annam
 granthiḥ tad granthim udgrathānīy¹ annakim² | mṛṣāve brahmanim ape sarram
 īrṣīr aśvajusman maham akāmo marīṣamy annatan annado bhūṣam sūhaḥ |
 aśa³ na śīro tāsāṃ brahmadhena chandasa furuso manik pranaḥ⁴ sūhaḥ | loham
 na śīro tāsāṃ aśvadhena chandasa furuso manik pranaḥ sūhaḥ | sisam na śīro
 tāsāṃ kakudhena chandasa furuso manik pranaḥ sūhaḥ | śarajam na śīro tāsāṃ
 sutarajena chandasa furuso manik pranaḥ sūhaḥ | gajatram na śīro tāsāṃ
 gajajena chandasa furuso manik pranaḥ sūhaḥ | annam na śīro tāsāṃ tīrṣā

jena candama puruso manih pranah svāha | *īṣṭir* na sthiro vasani anusūbhena
 chandasa puruso manih pranah svāha | *nakam* na sthiro vasani samrojjena chandasa
 puruso manih pranah svāha | *Brhaspatir* va sthiro vasani barhadena chandasa pu-
 ruso manih pranah svāha | *Brahmeva* sthiro vasani panktina chandasa puruso + *īṣṭir*
 pranah svāha | *Prajāpatir* va sthiro vasani atichandasena chandasa puruso manih
 pranah svāha | *Savitṛ*¹ na sthiro vasani sarvatedachandasena chandasa puruso
 manih pranah svāha | *prajāyati* va *jāyati*² *prajāya* vanitvasine 'nyasmai vāṛe
 yasmai kamajeta tasma ucchisitam dadāt | *sa* *hapti* *śalam* *variam* *jīta* *puna*
puna *prajuhjano*³ *jīvati* *am* *jīvati* *ete* || 8 ||

|| *Ity* *Āraṇyaka* *ekadāśo* 'adhyāyāḥ ||

¹ *udgratāṇany* B ² *da* B pr m, *homo* B sec m ³ *ya* B sec m ⁴ The
 scribe abbreviates henceforth to *pr svāha* I have so printed to save space ⁵ *savitṛ*
 B pr m, ⁶ *īṣṭir* B sec m, ⁷ *īṣṭva* A Possibly *savitṛ* *sva* with shortening may be meant (cf
 Macdonell *Sanskrit Grammar*, p 63, Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 321, 322)
⁸ *jāyati* B pr m, *cor* m marg ⁹ *prajuhjano* B, is just possible

ADHYĀYA XII

Om | *hasṭavarcaṣam* *prāṇatam* *brhadprajāḥ* |
yad *Aditya*¹ *tanvāḥ* *sambodhiva* |
tan *mahyanti* *samoduh* *sarvam*² *ete* |
Adityaso *Aditya*³ *sambudanaḥ* || 1 ||

yad *te* *varco* *jataredaḥ* |
brhad *bhavaty* *ahitam* |
tama *na* *varcata* *ivam* |
Agne *varcasvinam* *kuru* || 2 ||

jac *ca* *vaca* *va* *puruso* |
jac *ca* *hasṭy* *ahitam* |
svartne *gotu* *yad* *varcaḥ* |
māy *īd* *hasṭavarcaṣam* || 3 ||

yad *akṣita* *hiraṇyeta* |
gotu *svartne* *śam*⁴ *śam*⁵ *ī*
svartam *pūṣṭamanayam* |
māy *īd* *hasṭavarcaṣam* || 4 ||

māy *bhargo* *māy* *māhāḥ* |
māy *śam*⁶ *śam*⁷ *yad* *jātaḥ* |

tan mayi Prajāpatiḥ ।

dr̥iḥ dr̥iḥ vva dr̥mhatu ॥ 5 ॥¹ ॥ 1 ॥²

¹ *ta* B pr m ² *aria* A, B sec. m as in Atharvaveda, III, 22, 1; cf Whitney's translation, pp 126, 127. This verse has on the whole better readings than the Atharvaveda. ³ *Aditya* B ⁴ I have, for convenience, numbered the verses throughout. The text in the MS is only divided into sections. I have also printed the verses in Pādas without Sandhi. ⁵ For ver 1, cf Atharvaveda, III, 22, 1, ver 2, cf *ibid.*, III, 22, 4 and 3, vers 3, 4, cf *ibid.*, XIV, 1, 35, VI, 69, 1, ver 5, cf *ibid.*, VI, 69, 3 (with *dr̥iḥ dr̥iḥ vva dr̥mhatu*), Śimaveda, I, 603 (with *parameṣṭhi* for *tan mayi*) B omits *dr̥iḥ*

Ātmanā saragheṇa m̐ḥ ।

sam ankl̥m¹ madhuna p̐yāḥ ।

ṣaṭhā madhumaṣm̐ iḍcam ।

ācāsmi janesu ॥ 6 ॥

ghṛtād ulūpto² madhumān p̐yān̐dm̐ ।

dhanam̐jyo dharuno dharayisnuḥ ।

ruṇaṇ sapatnan³ adharam̐ ca kṛntan ।

a roha mat mahate saubhag̐ṣa ॥ 7 ॥

Prajāpati na itad dāmy anyah ।

vīva jaṣam pari t̐ dāh̐n̐ta ।

ṣaṭkamat te juh̐mat tan no astu ।

ṣyam ṣyam p̐ṣyo ṣajinam̐ ॥ 8 ॥⁴

ṣyam sano⁵ mudatam me sapatnan ।

Indra na Vritam p̐ritnam̐ iṣṭha ।

Agnir̐ vva kākṣam̐ iḍh̐r̐t̐h̐ puruṣ̐tr̐ ।

talesu nas iṣṭam̐ābho 'nu mar̐ṣi ॥ 9 ॥

ṣyam sano ṣo 'nuvād̐i k̐ṣa ।

Indra⁶ na Vritam̐ t̐ puro ruroṣa ।

anencdro t̐ m̐dho viṣaṣa ।

ṣatruṣat̐m̐ a bhara bh̐jand̐m̐ ॥ 10 ॥⁷ ॥ 2 ॥

¹ *samāhan* A, *sammāhan* B. Presumably an imperative from *śanāḥ*, trans, *Ātmanā* being voc. The parallel Atharvaveda, VI, 69, 2 (= IX, 1, 19), has *madhūmank̐tam̐ saubhag̐ṣi*, and in the last Pāda *atvānt̐m̐ janaḥ anu* which is better metre and syntax. I read "ank̐tam̐" for synt. cf *J R A S*, 1908, p 1124. ² *ulūpto* A, B. Cf Atharvaveda, V, 28, 14, XI, 33, 2, 46, 6. Scheffelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Agveda*, p 118, ver 9 a, below, ver 34. ³ *ṣaṭ* mad B. ⁴ = RV, X, 121, 30 and see Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p 612, below, ver 35. ⁵ *sa ṣo* B. ⁶ *k̐ṣa* (*k̐ṣa* A) vs only A, B. The parallel with *Indra* above seems conclusive. In both cases *Indra* a (or *Indro* vo) must be read *metre causa*. B has *taṣaro* corrected to *viro*. ⁷ Last line = RV, V, 4, 5, &c.

ṣayendra ṣatruḥ jaḥi śura dāṣṣan ।

Vritam̐ hat̐eta kul̐śena t̐ r̐ṣa¹ ।

augha na śūpān¹ pra nudat sapatnam |
 jahyāt sapatnām śadākṣit vancā || 11 ||
 am vṛica madhyāt pra² vṛicoparistat |
 vi vṛica paścat prati śūra vṛica |
 tīgṛā prannīlan maghavan amitrān |
 śūra³ vasantam Maruto 'nu jantu || 12 ||
 itam rudrar hetubhik pātvamānah |
 Indram manvānā Maruto juṣanta |
 vṛparnaś kankāś pra mśantu enan |
 mahiyātam dāmśtri vadhāntu || 13 ||
 brahmanullāṣya maghavan prāṇyātāś |
 vīṣag⁴ Indra bhāṅgāś palantu |
 ma jñātaram aśata mā⁵ pratisthām |
 mītho vighnānā upa jñāntu mṛtyum || 14 ||
 Agni jāsavin jāśate sam arpaṣya |
 Indravasim oparitam ita vaha |
 aṣam mardhā paramēthi satarcaś |
 sajatanam uttamaśloko astu || 15 || || 3 ||

¹ The metre requires *lena vṛica . . . ² *lapot* B the word being no doubt misunderstood
³ *pra vi* A, B, but not only this is bad metre (in no case is the metre good, but an *vṛica* may
 be read), but the *vi* following renders the double prefix most improbable ⁴ *amitrāś* *churs* A
 B, possibly for *sa vṛita(n)tam* ⁵ *vaiśā* A B ⁶ So I read The verse is a mutilated version of
 Atharvavedī, VI, 22, 3 (= VIII, 8, 21) *ma jñātaram ma pratisthām vandanta | mītho vighnānā*
upa yantū mṛtyum See also Śivalayana Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 10, 11 *f A O S, XXVI 127*
 B has *śatamāś*, *pratisthāmāho vighnavānāṃ jāti* A has *itā*, *vajālāṃ* The text is merely
 a conjecture ⁷ Cf Taittiriya Samhitā, V, 7, 4 3⁴⁻⁵, ending *somavānānam uttamaś lokā*
astu Either *sa jñā* or *ajñā* is possible, and *uttamaś lokā* or *uttamāślokā*

bhādrām paśyanta upa sedur agan |
 tāte dīkṣam vṛjāś svaroidaś |
 śatūś ksātram baham ojaś ca jutam |
 tad aśmai dēvu abhū sam namantam || 16 ||¹
 dhūta vidhūta paramota samdrk |
 Prājapatēś paramēthi satarcaś |
 śtomavi chandamā mūdā ma akūś |
 śtasmai vāśtram abhū sām namantām || 17 ||²
 abhy a vartadhvam upa sevāgnim |
 aṣam śastadhīpāt no astu |

aya vyāṇam anu sam rabhadhām |
imam paścād anu jīvatha sarit || 18 ||²

alardo¹ nāma jato 'si |
pura sūrya purosasah² |
tam ita sapainakṣayanam³ |
vedaiho⁴ vīśamobhayanambhānam || 19 ||

nardhe pramjita⁵ sarā⁶ dīśantam |
kaipela vakyam prīśanāh saheta |
pramāyukam tasya dīśantam ahuḥ |
īramanam bhāvam jo bībhārā || 20 || || 4 ||

¹ Cf Taittiriya Saṃhitā, V, 7, 4 3, Taittiriya Āranyaka, III 11, 9 (with *pālyanta*, *agri*, and *tāḥ*), Atharvaveda, XIV, 41 1, and Whitney's translation, p. 963 Cf p 349 A, B have *agri* and *pālyanta* ² Cf Taittiriya Saṃhitā, V, 7, 4 4 (with *śrīḥ* *śrīmaḥ*, and *addi sam* *namāma*) A has *namam* ³ Cf *ibid.*, V, 7 4, 5, with *uśa mīta śahim*, and *ro* (B has *mo*)

⁴ So A, B. The word may be connected with *śraśa* or *śraśa* Atharvaveda, XV, 131, 8 Cp p 349 ⁵ = Atharvaveda, X, 7, 31⁶ ⁷ *sapainakṣayanam* B But *kṣayanam* is too like *kṣeyanam* in MSS to render the reading doubtful ⁸ The metre is wrong and *veda* may belong to the line before, or *ślo* be an interpolation. ⁹ *pramjita* B pr m. ¹⁰ *sarā* B.

na sa śaptam¹ aśnati na kīlbiśam kṛīam |
nainam dīyo Varuṇo hanis dhītam |
namam kruddham manjato 'bhi janā² |
īramanam bhāvam jo bībhārā || 21 ||

tasya śvacam himsati³ jātavedāḥ |
na mamtam aśnati na hanis janā |
śaśyur aśmīu jaradāśiḥ praita |
īramanam bhāvam jo bībhārā || 22 ||

tasya praja duṣyate jyanamānā |
na śailago⁴ bhātati na pṛakṛṣṭa |
manjan mīlhas tasya kuktis juyate |
īramanam bhāvam jo bībhārā || 23 ||

tasyāpavādā na praiśadakā⁵ grhe |
na samprahmāṇyo⁶ na ticeśa śasmai |
nāśmīnā aśakṣiḥ kṛnate nīcekānam |
īramanam bhāvam jo bībhārā || 24 ||

nainam rakṣo na pūśo hmanāsi |
na jantubhako nitya aśuro na jākṣaḥ |

na sūtika tasya grheṣu¹ jāyate ।

iramanam baṣṭam 30 bīḍharta ॥ 25 ॥ ॥ 5 ॥

¹ sam (?) *suplam* A, B ² *abhinuati*^b A, B ³ Probably *metra cauto* (- o u after caesura)
Cf ver 25^a, 26^b ⁴ *Isuleho* B pr m, *Isulego* A, B see m *āhāvata* is dissyllabic Cf Hopkins's
Ancient Epic of India, II 260, and for a similar case in the *Āitareya Brahmana*, my note,
J R A S, 1903, p 302 ⁵ *pravalaka* B If *pravalaka* is right, the *ho* must add nothing
in the word, ⁶ *samapafayo* B pr m, *sapo* sec. m A has *vafata* ⁷ *kulasya* A

nainam vjaghro na trko na ātipe ।

na śtāpadam himsati kamcanainam ।

na hasinam kruddham upaiti bhūtim⁴ ।

iramanam baṣṭam 30 bīḍharta ॥ 26 ॥

nainam sarpo na prdukur hinasati ।

na tritiko na turaścīnaraṇi ।

natnam hrano⁵ āir abhi⁶ samhale ।

iramanam baṣṭam 30 bīḍharta ॥ 27 ॥

natnam pramatam⁴ Varuno hinasati ।

na maharo na grahaś śtūmarahit

paravarat chivam aśmas hrato ।

iramanam baṣṭam 30 bīḍharta ॥ 28 ॥

pramīyukam aśya dvisantam aśuś ।

purpat iva chinnot saha bandhanena ।

angha iva śarṇa pra mudat sapainan ।

iramanam baṣṭam 30 bīḍharta ॥ 29 ॥

ayam manū pratuaro jambā jṇaya bādhyait ।

anencandro Vritam ahann rama⁴ ca manitima ॥ 30 ॥ ॥ 6 ॥

¹ *āśiam* A, B see m Cf *J A O S*, XXVIII, 390

² *turaścīnaraṇa* B, °*cina*² A

³ *āśi* only A, B The animal *hrina* is doubtful (*Ātharvaveda* XI 2, 2 is taken otherwise by Whitney in his translation), and the *hrano* *āśi* is regular, hence I add *āir* ⁴ °*ram* B, see
Āitareya Āraṇyaka, II, 2, 1, 2 ⁵ *rama* B

sakendro dvasataś sahetararaṇi ।

sahasta prīṇayataś ।

naga iva purvopadaśhīam ।

abhi tūtha³ prīṇayataś ॥ 31 ॥

agad ayam baṣṭo manūś ।

sapainā²ksajano vṛsa ।

am pañanti kauśyaś sarvaśraś ।

jūtha sapainam samare sādhyuk² ॥ 32 ॥

amṛitam me manas sūtram Atvinav opī nahjalam ।
 bahīḥ sahasraśrīyo 'si ma le dharta risam¹ aham ॥ 33 ॥
 ghṛtad ulluṣṭo² madhūman payasam ।
 dhānamayo dharuno dhavayisnuḥ ।
 rujan sapānna³ adharams ca kṛtān ।
 ॥ roḥa mam mahale saubhagaya ॥ 34 ॥
 Prajāpate na tvad ekiny anyah ।
 viśva jānate pari te bādhnva ।
 yajñamas te juhumat tan no astu ।
 tanyam yajña palāyo rayinam ॥ 35 ॥
 śaśa stham mahān asuṣi pañca⁴ ॥ 7 ॥

¹ nta add B marg ² sapānnaśrīyo B Cf Atharvaveda I 29, 4, ॥ ³ sa
 āyā B. ⁴ risam B. B has dīvaḥ ⁵ ur A ulluṣṭo B cf ver 7 ⁶ sapānna
 B, cf ver 7 ⁷ Le RV, X 152 1-5 giving in all forty verses Their use in the ritual
 (XII 8) is by verses 1 8 9 14 15 18 19, 20-35 36 40

Athato mamīkaśpah¹ ī bhūtikamāḥ pāpina trirātropoṣito jūṣaḥ haṣṭino danṣan
 mātram uddhṛtyagnim upasomadhaya² parisaṃhṛja parisiṣṭya paryukṛja daksinam
 jāno acyellārato 'gneḥ kamze manim kṛtva hutva heman manau sampatam anayet ।
 haṣṭarcatam ity etabhiḥ pratyrcam³ astabhiḥ saplārātram madhusarpiṣer tāsā-
 jita trirātram ekam ta bādhnuyād⁴ ghṛtad ulluṣṭo ity elayarcā । aśa evollāram
 tadābhir hrāḍyaśulagramanīm pratolugramanīm ta mulatugramanīm⁵ tād kṛdāra
 saramanīm ta mamśaudane tāsājita trirātram ekam ta bādhnuyat । aśa evollāram
 caśarbhur vṛśabha⁶ fragugramanīm ghṛtaudane tāsājita trirātram ekam va bādhn-
 yat । aśa evollāram elayairandamanīm śūaudane⁷ tāsājito trirātram ekam va
 bādhnuyat । aśa evollāram śolāśabhir⁸ bahīam saplārātram madhusarpiṣer tāsājito
 trirātram ekam tād bādhnuyād ghṛtad ulluṣṭa ity elayarcā । aśa evollāram pañcabhir
 mahavarāhaśyodoham⁹ mudgaudane tāsājita trirātram ekam vā bādhnuyād chaklau
 sah¹⁰ praiḥamam haṣṭichāyājam tanyaghṛe tapti carmany aśino vapi juhuyād aśino
 vāpi juhuyat ॥ 8 ॥

॥ Ity Āranyake śraddhāto 'dhyāyān ॥

¹ aśa B ² pratyrcam B. ³ bādhnuyād B. ⁴ mulatā B, mātā A ⁵ pṛabha B
⁶ śaudmana B. ⁷ śolāśabhir B. ⁸ mahavarāhaśod B. o in MSS ॥ often confused
 with a cf Hoerle *Ostvolky* p 132 The name of a wood of sorts seems essential and *śūaudam*
 (a 'besom', cf Taittiriya Brahmana, III, 8, 4 3) may be meant The alternative is to take
śūaudam as a gerund ⁹ sah B.

ADHYAYA XIII

Athaho vairagyasamskrīe karire brahmayajñamśho bhavet । oḥa punarmṛiyam
 jayati । tad u ha valmā dravīṣṭyaḥ śraddā jo manīṣṭyo mididhāśikṛjā uti । tam elam

vedanunācānena vṛndisante brahmacāryena śāpasa braddhaya jagñenamatākena ceti
Mandukya 1) śatmad evampoc chanlo¹ danta uparatas itākṣṇa braddhavallo bhūtvai
 many atmanam paśyed ita *Mandavya* 1) 30 jam vyññanamayaḥ puruṣaḥ praneṣu
 1a eṣa neti neti atmanavagrīhya idam brahmedam ksātram² ime deva ime veda ime
 loka imāni sarvaṇi bhūtanidam sarvaṃ 3a) ayaṃ atma 1 sa eṣa śat tvāni anity
 atmanavogamyo 'ham brahmasmi 1 tad etad brahmapurṇam apāram anapāram
 anantaram abhayaṃ ayaṃ atma brahma sarvaṇubhū 1) anuśasanam 1) *Yajña*
 1a) 1) 1 tam etam napuṣṭrīya nūnanīkvasini brūyad ita 1 ya imāni adbhīḥ parigr-
 hītam tatumaśm dhanasya purnam dadād idam eva tato bhūya idam eva tato
 bhūya 1) anuśasanam 1³ tam⁴ etam upanīśadam vedatīro na yaishā katham cana
 vadat⁵ 1 tad etad vachjyudītam 1111

11 *Ity Aranyake trayodaśo 'dhyāyaḥ* 11⁷

¹ tichanta A B

² kṣātra B

³ This is an exact quotation save for the insert on of apāram of Bṛhadaranyaka Upaniṣad II 5 19 B pr m has ārahma For the earl er part of that Upaniṣad, II 4 5, 6 IV, 4 25 27, 28 and for the next words VI 3 20 (13 Kauva)

⁴ This is clearly an inaccurate reminiscence of Chandogya Upaniṣad III, 11 6

⁵ tam B

⁶ vade B

⁷ Simply 1191111 but (a) this contradicts the colophon to XII 8, (b) there is no connexion with XII (c) A Weber & MS Catal 11 6 has XIII Cf J & A S 1908, pp 380 381

ADHYAYA XIV

rcam mardhanam jagusum ullamangam 1
 samnam sīro thartanam mundamundam 1
 nadhite dhite vedam ahus tam apām 1
 śīra¹ cātvasan kurute kabandham 1111²
 śīhanur ayaṃ dharaḥaraḥ kilāḥḥḥ 1
 adhitya vedam na vijanati 30 rtham 1
 30 rthajñā ita śakānam bhādrām asūte 1
 nakam eti jñānamdhutapapma 1111³

¹ śīra B

² The numbers are added by me

³ It ends with 111011 Really

Adhyaya XIV should be combined with Adhyaya XIII into one Adhyaya but the Berlin MS (Weber Catal 11, 6) treats this as a separate Adhyaya For ver 2, see Nirukta J, 18 Burnell Samhitopaniṣad Brāhmaṇa p 38

ADHYAYA XV

Atha 1a) 1 om 1 namo brahmane nama acāryebhyaḥ 1 Guṇakhyoc Chāṅkha
 yanad asmadhīr adhītam 1 Guṇakhyāḥ Saṅkhyayogāḥ Kaholai Kauṣitakeḥ 1 Kaholai
 Kauṣitakeḥ Uddalaka¹ Aruneḥ 1 Uddalaka Aruneḥ Priyavratat Saumapeḥ 1 Priya-
 vratat Saumāpāḥ Semapat 1 Saumapāḥ Saumai Prutvachyat 1 Saumai Prativachyat²
 Prativachyat 1 Prativachye Bṛhadīśvat 1 Bṛhadīśvat Saumayoh 1 Saumayur Uddalakaḥ 1

*Uddālako Viśvamanasah | Viśvamanā Vjaktāi | Vjaktvāh Sakamācitrai | Sakamācitra
Dharātāt | Dharātā Viśvāmītrai | Viśvāmītra Indrat | Indrah Prajapateh |
Prajapatir Brahmanah | Brahma Siyambhuḥ | namo brahmane namo brahmane |*

॥ *Ity Āranyake pañcadaśo 'dhyāyāḥ* ॥¹

॥ *Iti Śaṅkhāyanāranyakam samāptam* ॥

¹ *Uddālako* B. ² *Somah Pratsvetyak*, Winternitz, *Bodl Catal*, p. 60. A has *Somapih* and *Somah*. ³ *ity Āranyake Upanisado ehadāśo 'dhyāyāḥ* | *iti Śaṅkhāyana Upanisadaḥ samap-
tāḥ | sampurnam | Srikanu Irissanīat* 1837 (= A D 1781) *varse mita pyethāindā* 15 *śukravat*
B. But this is all on f. 87, which is a recent restoration and is of no authority. The number
XV is given in the Berlin MS to the *Āmā*, which ends *iti Śaṅkhāyanāranyake pañcadaśo
'dhyāyāḥ* ॥ *cha* ॥ *samaptāḥ* ॥ *śubham bhavatu* ॥ *vasis samvat* 1734 *varse ardhāśvādā* 13 *janau
abhyantarānaganyānīyaraṇanagaramadhye | Rajapure vastavyam* *śiśhadikṣitānāmhaminara
gṛhamāḥ* ॥ *paṇḍyānīyānīrsmāhaputrapautrapuṣhanarīham* | The *Āmā* clearly begins with
the author of the *Āranyaka* i.e. Gṛakhyā, why Oldenberg (*S B E* XXIX 4 §) should
think the author of the *Sūtras* is meant I cannot understand. See also my *Śaṅkhāyana Ara-
nyaka*, p. 72.

INDEX I

QUOTATIONS FROM RGVEDA.

(The first numbers in brackets denote the reference in the Samhitā. The second, the page and column of Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance*. The *prathikas* are given exactly as in the Samhitā text, except that the original forms *in pausa* are restored. References marked § are to the Sankhlyana Āranyaka.)

Agniṁ nara dīdāstidbhir aranyāḥ (VII, 1, 1^a),
I, 1, 2 (11^b) § I, 2

Agnir neta - sa vstrāhāt (III, 20, 4^a), I, 2, 2
(15^b)

Agniś tava hrūvo vyaṇāḥ (X, 140, 2^a), V, 3,
2 (23^b)

adāh tu madhu madhumadhī yodhāḥ (X, 120,
3^a), I, 3, 4, V, 1, 6 (49^b)

Aditur mata sa pita sa pitrāḥ (I, 89, 10^b),
III, 1, 5 (50^b), § VII, 15

asya na deva Savitāḥ (V, 82, 4^a), I, 5, 3 (53^b),
§ II, 18

anāṁ pita anābhīṇa nīkīyāḥ (IV, 36, 1^a),
I, 5, 3 (61^b)

anustubhām anu carisvapamanam (X, 124, 9^a),
II, 3, 3 (67^a)

anne samasyi yad asuṁ manisāḥ (X, 29, 4^a),
I, 5, 2 (not in Bloomfield, 75^a)

apalyaṇi gupam anipadyamānam (I, 164, 31^a),
II, 1, 6 (79^b) Verse cited in full

apān pān etā svadhāya grbhīṇāḥ (I, 164, 38^a),
II, 1, 8 (81^a) Verse cited in full

asādhy agniḥ samidha pānam (V, 1, 1), I,
1, 1 (89^b)

asāḥ ita puruṣalayaḥ (VIII, 3, 7^a), V, 2, 2
(91^b)

asāḥ ita ita nomaṁāḥ (VII, 32, 22^a), V, 2, 2
(91^b)

asāḥ pita vāḥ surādhatam (VIII, 49, 1^a), V,
2, 4 (92^b)

asāḥ etā rāṣipate rayinām (VI, 31, 1^a), V,
2, 2 (97^a)

asam te astu karyatāḥ (III, 44, 1^a), V, 2, 4
(105^b), § II, 9

asvayanto maghavanam Indra vajraḥ (VII, 31,
23^a), V, 1, 6 (128^a)

Asvina yajusvīr itāḥ (I, 3, 1^a), I, 1, 4 (129^a)

asat tu me paritāḥ subhivagaḥ (X, 27, 1^a), I,
2, 1, V, 1, 1 (132^a) § I, 3

asya vanaṁśya palitāṁśya hataḥ (I, 154, 1^a), I,
3, 2, V, 3, 2 (145^b), § II, 18

asvinaḥ vtrāḥantamam (VIII, 74, 4^a), I, 1,
1 (154^b)

asvīm na vavṛhēdibhir (X, 21, 1^a), V, 3, 2
(155^a)

a gha ye agnām (VIII, 45, 1^a), V, 2, 3 (155^b)

a tu na Indra hrāmāntam (VII, 81, 1^a), V,
2, 2 (158^a)

a tena yatam manas jayisyā (X, 39, 12^a),
II, 3, 8 (149^a)

a te maha Indroty ugra (VII, 28, 1^a), V, 1, 2
(159^a)

a tva rathām yathālaye (VIII, 68, 1^a), I, 2, 1
(161^a) § I, 3

ad et prathāṁśya vātāḥ (VIII, 6, 20^a), III, 2,
4 (162^b)

a dhurvo armaḥ (VII, 34, 4^a), V, 2, 2 (162^b)

a na Indro durad ā na asat (IV, 10, 1^a), V,
2, 2 (167^b)

a na bhadrāḥ hrātavo yantu vīśvātāḥ (I, 89,
1^a), I, 5, 3. (V, 3, 2 as *anobhadrāyānu*, not
in Bloomfield) (169^a)

a na vāṣaṇāṁśyaḥ (VIII, 90, 1^a), V, 2, 4 (170^b)

a yajñam Āndrazartana (I, 3, 3^a), I, 1, 4 (179^b)
a yajñe tanaśa śakā (I, 173, 1^a), II, 2, 2 (180^a)
a yajñy adriśhikā tulam (V, 40, 1^a), V, 2, 5 (180^a)
a yajñy antam upa bandhūreśhikā (RV 2 an^a) (III, 43, 1^a), V, 3, 1 (180^b)
atratāo 'ratāso na kartvīśhikā (I, 55, 5^a), II, 1, 6 (189^b)
a śasate jñatī keryanty uttī (I, 165, 4^a), I, 2, 2 (190^b)
utthā hi jñata na mādē (I, 80, 1^a), V, 2, 2 (198^a)
idam taso jñatam andhah (VIII, 2, 1^a), I, 2, 1 (198^b), Ś I, 3
Indra ut tsoṣaś cāh (VIII, 2, 4^a), V, 2, 3 (206^a)
Indram taita anivāhan (I, 11, 1^a), I, 5, 2, V, 1, 1 (207^b)
Indra madhya cā śhi (VIII, 23 5^a), I, 2, 1 (210^b)
Indram id gāthina śhrīat (I, 7, 1^a), V, 2, 1 (212^a)
 RV, I, 7 1-9 are called *arkat* at in I, 4, 1)
Indratraya ime suta (I, 2, 4^a), I, 1, 4 (213^a)
 I śasā "and b are cited
Indratya nu turyāso jñā tucam (I, 32, 1^a), V, 2, 2 (213^b)
Indragṇi jñatam su nah (VIII, 40, 1), I, 5, 2, V, 3, 1 (220^a)
Indratya sama gnyata (VIII, 98, 1^a), V, 2, 5 (223^a) Ś II, 10
Indratya hi dyanr asuro anamrata (I, 131, 1^a), V, 1, 1 (223^b)
Indra yajñe nītrāśhano (I, 3, 5^a), I, 2, 4 (224^a)
Indra yajñe tīśryama (I, 3, 6^a), I, 2, 4 (224^a)
Indra yajñe dhīyentiśh (I, 3, 4^a, 5, 6), I, 2, 4 (214^a)
Indra madhya t pīdhe (I, 81, 1^a) V, 2, 2 (227^b)
imam stomam arhate jīatavedast (I, 94, 1^a), I, 5, 2 (231^a)
ima nu kām dāntam: śīatāhama (I, 157, 1^a), V, 2, 2 (234^a)
ināhyanīr afayntaśh (X, 213, 1^a), V, 1, 1 (244^a)
ugro jayā tīryja tīdāhēnu (VIII, 10, 1^a), V, 2, 2 (245^b)
ut tīrjā Brahmanasfate (I, 40, 1^a), I, 2, 1 (255^b)

ud u brahmany asratā śratatya (V II, 21, 1^a), V, 2, 2 (261^a)
ud ghed abhī śrutamaghām (V III, 93, 1^a), V, 2, 3 (261^a)
ud turyām tamastat jñat (I, 50, 10^a), III, 2, 4 (263^b)
mūhāyām śhrīnastat ca nah (V III, 61, 1^a), V, 2, 4 (272^b)
chāh śhrīpamāh na somudranti a tūśa (V, 114, 4^a), III, 1, 6 (296^a), Ś VII 18 Verse cited in full -
enāra jayā upa nah śhrīpamāh (I, 130, 1^a), V, 1, 1 (303^b)
enāra śhrīnastat turyām (I, 2, 1^a), II, 2, 5 (302^b)
etā śtome mākā ugratya tūśa (V II, 69, 5^a), I, 5, 2 (307^b)
amozāśh cāśhrīnāśh (I, 3, 1^a), I, 1, 4 (312^b)
kātara jñat: kātaraśh śhrīpamāh (I, 185, 1^a), I, 1, 3 (316^b)
hāśha mākām ayāśhāt karyā kātul (IV, 22, 1^a), V, 2, 2 (317^a), Ś I 2
karyā tūśā taitayataśh śhrīpamāh (I, 165, 1^a), I, 2, 2, V, 1, 1 (319^a)
garbhe nu sann apu etam anvedam (IV, 27, 1^a), II, 5, 1 (345^a) the verse is given in full
gām atvam tūśhyam Indram kām (VI, 46, 2^a), V, 1, 6 (346^b)
gāntat mīmīśha śhrīpamāh (I, 164, 41^a), I, 5, 2 (355^b)
cītram dēvānam ud agnī anīkām (I, 115, 1^a), III, 2, 3 (369^a), Ś VIII, 4 Verse cited in full
jayāśhano nu śhrīpamāh (V III, 77, 1^a), V, 2, 3 (372^b)
jñatīśhā ugrāśh śhrīpamāh tūśya (V, 73, 1^a), I, 2, 2, V, 2, 1 (371^b)
jñatāśhā tūśhyam śhrīpamāh (I, 99, 1^a), I, 5, 3 (376^b)
tam v abhī śhrīpamāh (VIII, 15, 1^a), V, 2, 5 (408^b)
tam tūśhyam śhrīpamāh (VIII, 88, 1^a), V, 2, 4 (387^a)

Nitram āṇṇe jata śakṣam (I, 2, 7^a), I, 1, 4 (713^b) Padas ^a and ^b are cited.
mo su tra vaghataḥ cana (VII, 32, 1^a), V, 2, 4 (723^b)

ya anāyā paratāṇaḥ (VI, 45, 1^a), V, 2, 5 (724^a)
ya Indra samapatamaḥ (VIII, 12, 1^a), V, 2, 5 (725^a)

ya eka id vidayate (I, 84, 7^a), V, 2, 5 (726^b)
ya satraha vicarsanaḥ (VI, 46, 3), V, 2, 4 (727^b)

yatra brahmī parāmanāḥ (IX, 113, 6^a), III, 2, 4 (741^b)

yad agna mē samut bhavati (X, 11, 8), V, 1, 1 (749^b)

yad anis ya ca durate (IX, 67, 31), III, 2, 4 (751^a)

yad Indra praṅ apag udāt (VIII, 4, 1), V, 2, 4 (753^b)

yad Indrahāni yadā tvam (VIII, 24, 1), V, 2, 5 (754^a)

yad evaṇa (X, 74, 6^a), V, 2, 3 (756^b)

yas tignāṅgu vṛadho na bhīmaḥ (VII, 19, 1^a), V, 2, 3 (770^b)

yas tityaja sacividam lakṣyam (X, 71, 6^a), III, 2, 4 (770^b, where the variant in TA is not noted), § VIII, 6 Verse cited in full

yasya iyac cāmbaram madē (VI, 43, 1^a), V, 2, 5 (774^b)

ya Indra bhūya adharāḥ (VIII, 97, 1^a), V, 2, 4 (778^b), § II 9

yvad adyādyāsthrīvaḥ savat at dat (X, 114, 8^a), I, 3, 8 (786^a)

yvad brahma vṛiṣṭam idvāt vāt (X, 114, 8^a), I, 3, 8 (786^a)

yo jāta eva prāthama manatvam (II, 12, 1^a), I, 5, 2, V, 3, 1 (808^b)

yonis ta Indra sadvā akṛti (VIII, 24, 1^a), V, 3, 5 (810^b)

yo vāya carānānām (VIII, 70, 1^a), V, 2, 4 (812^b)

raikhanīram a jabhara Varisṭhaḥ (X, 181, 1^a), III, 1, 6 (817^b)

ratrīṣṭha (X, 127, 1^a), III, 2, 4 (823^b)

retatr naḥ sadhamaḥ (I, 30, 13^a), V, 2, 5 (830^b)

vaṇe na va yo adhaya cakṣu (X, 29, 1^a), I, 5, 2, V, 3, 1 (837^a)

vayam ghaṇa satatāntaḥ (VIII, 33, 1), V, 2, 4 (838^a)

vaj sa a yaki darhata (I, 2, 1^a), I, 1, 4 (860^a) Padas ^a and ^b are cited.

varīvalatyaṇya savate (III, 27, 1^a), V, 2, 5 (863^a)

vaṇḍhanaḥ savate bhūjyaḥ (X, 120, 2^a), I, 3, 4 (863^a), § II, 1

vidhūm dadṛṣṇam samāsa bahūnam (X, 35, 5^a), V, 3, 1 (869^a)

vīṣṭaḥ sa vṛiṣṭam (VIII, 74, 1^a), I, 1, 1 (877^b), § II, 2

vaṇḍanaṇya dṛiṣṇam yavate (III, 2, 1^a), I, 3, 3 (906^b)

vadhaya a sṛamaḥ (VIII, 24, 1^a), V, 2, 5 (951^b)

vamīṣa vṛiṣṇam (VIII, 46, 10^a), V, 2, 5 (966^a)

vamīṣṇam (VIII, 44, 1^a), V, 1, 1 (980^b)

vahavāda vṛiṣṇam vṛiṣṇa (X, 114, 8^a), V, 3, 8 (1001^a)

vāta at tvam vṛiṣṇa Indra soma (VI, 23, 1^a), V, 2, 2 (1015^a)

vavṛiṣṇam vṛiṣṇa (I, 4, 1^a), V, 2, 3 (1021^b)

vavṛiṣṇa vṛiṣṇa (I, 115, 1^a), II, 2, 4, III, 2, 3 (1025^b)

vavṛiṣṇa vṛiṣṇa (VIII, 2, 18), V, 2, 3 (1054^b)

vavṛiṣṇa vṛiṣṇa (X, 110, 3^a), I, 3, 4, V, 2, 6 (1055^a)

vavṛiṣṇa vṛiṣṇa (VII, 1, 1^a), I, 1, 2 (1065^b)

vavṛiṣṇa vṛiṣṇa (II, 5, 1^a), I, 1, 1 (1072^b)

In the Śānti verses (see Crit Note on I, 2) also occur —

vavṛiṣṇa vṛiṣṇa (IV, 31, 3^a), (not in Bloomfield, 96^b)

vavṛiṣṇa vṛiṣṇa (II, 43, 3^a), (not in Bloomfield, 186^b)

vavṛiṣṇa vṛiṣṇa (IV, 31, 1^a), (319^a)

vavṛiṣṇa vṛiṣṇa (IV, 31, 1^a), (not in Bloomfield, 321^b)

¹ In view of the variants in the MSS I have given only the first Padas. All the verses are assumed to be quoted in full.

- taś caktur devatām* (VII, 66, 15), (not in Bloomfield, 386^a)
- tvam Agre vṛatāṣu aśi* (VIII, 11, 1), (not in Bloomfield, 450^b)
- śādhram karmabhāḥ śṛṇvāṁsu dēvaḥ* (I, 89, 8^a), (664^a, where only the *pratiśa* is given)
- śādhram nō aśi vṛtāya manāḥ* (X, 30, 1^a), (not in Bloomfield, 664^a)
- The following occur in the Śaṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka I, II, VII-XII
- Aditā dyaus Aditir antarikṣam* (I, 89, 10^a), VII, 15 (50^b) Verse cited in full
- adhvaryavo bhāratendroja sūnam* (II, 14, 1^a), II, 16 (59^b)
- astasy Agniḥ śimśadbhīr arkaś* (I, 141, 13^a), II, 18 (136^a)
- n mandrair Indro harābhīḥ* (III, 45, 1^a), II 9 (176^b)
- Indrah mīśru somasu* (VIII, 13, 1^a), II, 10 (118^a)
- uta aya naḥ Sarasvatī putrā* (VII, 95, 4^a), I, 1 (151^a)
- ud vayasā tanīśas parā* (I, 50, 10^a), VIII, 5 (163^b) Verse cited in full
- ud vām caktur Varuṇa supraśikṣam* (VII, 61, 1^a), I, 1 (163^b)
- uruvṛatāsa mahāni māśaśe* (I, 160, 2^a), II, 18 (176^a)
- ṛvō ta Indro śthāvaritya bāhu* (VI, 47, 8^a), II, 4 (194^b)
- ka u tvatāḥ kāmā yajñīyamam* (IV, 43 1^a) I, 1 (315^b)
- kim u tvistāḥ kim yavistā na ajagan* (I, 161, 1^a), II, 18 (327^b)
- kuṇḍ āṅga nandisa ye vṛdhāśāḥ* (VII 91, 1^a), I, 1 (339^b)
- ko vas trāśa tāsavaḥ ko vavṛte* (IV, 55, 1^a), I, 1 (335^b)
- ta hi dyāvapṛthivī tśvafamābhūva* (I, 160, 1^a), II, 18 (445^b)
- dēvayor eti suryaś tatantvan* (VII, 61, 1^b), I, 1 (491^a)
- dūrav śṛāya sūdhage vy avat* (VII, 95, 6^a), I, 1 (513^b)
- na nindīma carīvaṁ ye mahākūlāḥ* (I, 161, 1^a), II, 18 (519^b)
- śam na Indrāgnī bhavatam atobhāḥ* (VII, 35, 1^a), (917^a, where only the *pratiśa* is given)
- śam nō Mīśro śam Varuṇāḥ* (I, 30, 9^a), (not in Bloomfield, 918^b)
- stute yamam svavatam parvasābhīḥ* (VI, 49, 1^a), (1041^a, where only the *pratiśa* is given, as in the next)
- syoma pṛkṣta dhāva* (I, 11, 15^a), (1046^a)
- Prajāpate na tośaś cāny anyāḥ* (X, 121, 10^a), XII, 2, v 8 (612^a) Verses in full
- balitka tad vṛjate dhāyo darśatam* (I, 141, 1^a), II, 18 (644^b). Insert *tad* in Friedländer's text
- ḥṛtāś mahānāś urvāgnī vṛ rajutā* (V, 55, 2^b), II, 18 (650^b)
- maśas tan nama guhyam pūruṣpṛkṣ* (X, 55, 2^a), VII, 30 (694^b) Verse cited in full
- mahāḥ Indro urvāś d carīvaṁ pṛkṣ* (VI, 19, 1^a), I, 1 (695^b)
- mā na śicūḥyo ye abhi dṛvhaś pade* (II, 13, 16^a), VII, 12 (706^a) Verse cited in full
- ya cāś ed ānyat carīvaṁ namam* (VI, 11, 1^a), II, 4 (716^b)
- yām suryasya dukṣitā vṛṇā* (IV, 43, 2^a), I, 1 (728^b)
- yavat tarāś tanvō yavat ayaḥ* (VIII, 91, 4^a), I, 1 (786^a)
- yavāś maruś cāśvāś āśhīpamāḥ* (VII, 91, 4^b), I, 1 (786^b)
- vide vṛdhāya daktam mahāḥ hi tāḥ* (VIII, 13, 1^a), II, 10 (867^b)
- vīśvā vānāni dhīmāni* (V, 82, 6^a), II, 18 (885^b)
- vīśvō hy auro avir ajaganā* (X, 38, 1^a), II, 4 (891^a)
- śaro stika mahāḥ aśi* (X, 135, 1^a), II, 13, 2 II, 7 (923^b)
- sa prānātha kavī vṛdhāḥ* (VIII, 63 4^a), II, 15 (974^a)
- sāhayaś Varuṇa Mīśro marīd* (IV, 55, 1^a), I, 1 (1005^a)
- stotaram in maghavānā aya vṛdhāya* (VIII, 1^a), II, 9 (1041^b)
- stomaś Vātsiya vavṛdhe* (VIII, 6, 1^a), II, 8 (1043^a)

INDEX II

QUOTATIONS FROM OTHER SOURCES THAN THE RIGVEDA, NIVIDS, PRAISAS, ETC

(All the Padas of metrical passages are given as in Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance* (*Harvard Oriental Series*, Vol. V, 1906) Metrical passages are marked (v) The references in brackets are to page and column of the *Concordance*)

- agnir evanadharyah prathitra svadā dhi jā
sam V, 1, 1 (14^b)
- atichandāsā tra (chandasādhanā) V, 1, 4
(348^b, under gayatriṇa tra, &c. The separate
Mantras should rather be given separately)
- attha tanur va tanto astu bharyam (v), I, 3, 4
(47^b)
- anu dyavapṛthivī purvādhūm V, 1, 3 (v) (64^b)
- anu mām Indro anu mām Bṛhaspātīh, V, 2,
1 (v) (66^a)
- anu mām āstirādvratna vāhātum V, 2, 1 (v)
(66^a)
- anu samuso dīlāh, IV, 1 (v) (66^b)
- anu sōmo anu vāg dity dīvi, V, 1, 1 (v) (67^b)
- anirakṣam anagayam dyaur evanadharyā hā
yāsam V, 1, 1 (76^a, with the misreading
"ārtso, which is in no text or MS. and is
contradicted by the context)
- ant vād vāhāh sircasmad āttaram, V, 3, 2 (v)
(not in Bloomfield)
- amant v a vāhā yajña tra prabhū (v) 1 pra
bhū bhūyāsam, V, 1, 1 (74^a)
- annasūbhe varāpṛstirām gūbhagam, V, 3, 2 (v)
(not in Bloomfield)
- apānam antukhāra V, 1, 4 (31^b)
- apān iya tvā (ulīkādhi), V, 1, 4 (51^a)
- amriyaya iriyam mahim V, 3, 2 (v) (102^a)
- ayudhāram amriam dāhānam, V, 3, 2 (v)
(not in Bloomfield)
- arcanty arādm devadā h) marāhā, V, 2, 2 (v)
(113^a)
- avratām hūnoti na apṛad rayāh, V, 2, 2 (v)
(125^a, under avratā)
- akhar tra soam vāstir tra prāyā bhūyāsam, V,
1, 1 (130^a)
- Adityas tvā jātāh &c., V, 1, 4 (165^a, cf 164^b),
S I, 7
- anusūbhāna tra (chandasādhanā), V, 1, 4
(334^a)
- ape vāra tra ādāhya tra vāpam bhūyāsam, V,
1, 1 (171^a)
- āhāts tvām āhātsvāhāh (v), IV, 1 (176^a)
- āyāts tvā mātṛā (v) IV, 1 (179^b)
- āyuk prādm me dhātṛā V, 3, 1 (180^b, cf
Katyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 4, 12, where
prādm is vāt vā)
- āyā mātṛā manyāts (v), IV, 1 (183^a)
- ā stobhāt: tvā yuvā sā Indrāh (v), V, 1, 2
(193^b)
- īdām madhū, V, 1, 1 (204^a)
- īdām madhū 3 V, 1, 1 (204^a, no separate head),
ind vātṛā sāmajāh parvātāhāh (v) V, 2, 1
(205^a, as ind vātṛā &c.)
- Indrāh hīrādhāntam amrtam tyāma (v) V, 3,
1 (207^a see also note for parallel)
- Indrāh pātis tadvātam pāntrā d (v), V, 1, 1
(207^a)
- Indrāh hīrādhāntam pāhātra āvāh (v), V, 2, 1
(214^a)
- Imrap dhātṛāya sādhye (v), IV, 1 (210^b, cf
RV, I, III, 3 5^a)

- Indraya dhātūdam dīkṣak* (v) V, 2, 1 (215^b)
Indraya rīntyaṇ brāhī (v), V, 2, 1 (216^a)
Indra tade tām u utuṣ (v) IV, 1 (218^b)
Indro tātām tarupati (v), V, 3, 1 (228^b)
imaṇi tīrasulam pīḍa, V, 1, 1 (231^b)
ītam na bhīrāvāramā lāntanīham (v), V, 2, 2 (239^a)
īte hī Śakti (v), IV, 1 (246^a)
ukhāṣi yaya tamaraya, V, 3, 2, 3 (one is pre fixed), (246^b, 313^a)
uḥa brāhī mēdīkumati kīyāntāh (v), V, 2, 2 (266^a as *uḥapratī*)
uḥaḥi vīvādāha (quasi verse), IV, 1 (272^a)
uḥa mēnyaya manyāḥ (quasi verse), IV, 1 (272^b)
ṛdām talyāṇi tīyāyīmī vīcānām (v), V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield)
ṛḥur vīgāḥ eṇā (v), V, 2, 1 (291^a as *īatrum* &c, which rather belongs to the end of the preceding Pada)
eṇā ta vīkṣa bhāṭayāh (v), V, 3, 2 (300^a as *ukhāḥkūlayāh*)
eṇā hī deṇā 3 h IV, 1 (305^a, no *pīnti*)
eṇā hī Pūnā 3 u, IV, 1 (305^a, no *pīnti*)
eṇā hī Pūnā 3 u IV, 1 (305^a, no *pīnti*)
eṇā hī lāṇṛk IV, 1 (309^a)
eṇā hīndrā 3 IV, 1 (305^a as *hīndram*)
eṇā hy agnā 3 IV, 1 (305^a, no *pīnti*)
eṇā hy eṇā IV, 1 (305^b)
esa brāhmin V, 2, 2 (*pratiśa* only) (306^b)
chy eva 3 tādāḥ mādhu, V, 1, 1 (309^a)
auhapīdhanā naktūṣi &c (v), III, 2, 5 (316^a gives other citations but not this)
aurmahāna tva (*chandasasūdhāna*), V, 1, 4 (348^a)
brāhī chandā ṛdām brāhī (v), IV, 1 (356^b)
gīyatrena tva (*chandasasūdhāna*), V, 1, 4 (348^a)
gāva tva pūnarbhūva nīkūnām tva nīrīcāya dhāyāsam, V, 1, 1 (348^b)
gauri nam tva vīdīyē (v) III, 2, 5 (not in Bloomfield)
ekīṭva abhī na naya (v) IV, 1 (368^a)
gagatena tva (*chandasasūdhāna*), V, 1, 4 (348^a)
gītarām āparajulam, IV, 1 (381^b)
gyāṭir vāhar āpratevādāh pūrvam (v), V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield)
hāpātana Indragyasthām zahāradhāram, V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield)
tām mīḍye hāvamāṣi (v) IV, 1 (406^b)
kāḥkar ma tād dīkṣāva, V, 3, 2 (424^a)
kīyāh prandīyāyīdānam mīnāṣak, V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield)
kīnāḥm vīṭāṇa apyāṣam V, 3, 2 (440^b)
kī na deṇāh mēnūṣak kīrma yāṇṭā, V, 1, 1 (441^b)
kīntīkūṣa tva (*chandasasūdhāna*), V, 1, 4 (348^b)
todam hy kī tīve (v), V, 2, 2 (455^a, cf IV, IV, 3, 2, 7^a)
dentāh parivṛta pātīḥ (v), III, 2, 5 (not in Bloomfield)
dadhīpīndām dhātūdam lāṇṛk (dub read) (v), V, 2, 1 (475^a)
dhāpīdēna tva (*chandasasūdhāna*), V, 1, 4 (348^b)
dhēnu pūvāṭi dhātūh trāṇam prandī (v), V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield)
mamas te gīyatraya, V, 1, 2 (533^a)
mamas te brāhī V, 1, 2 (533^b)
mamas te bhāṇṛaya V, 2, 2 (533^b)
mamas te nāḥantayaya V, 1, 2 (533^b)
nāḥāṇṛa d dāḥāṇṛa (dub read) (v) V, 2, 1 (545^b)
nandam tām mēnyam tām vyāṣe (v), IV, 1 (565^b)
pāṭīcāṇṭīyaya stomaṭya &c, V, 1, 3 (563^a)
pāṭīn vīṣam me dīkṣāva V, 3, 1 (578^a)
pāṇṭīcā tva (*chandasasūdhāna*), V, 1, 4 (348^b)
pāṭīro ma vīṣam vīḍm ca bhāṇṛam, V, 1, 1 (583^a)
pīnīrāmī tām kīntīḥ ma Indra (v), V, 2, 1 (588^a)
pūvā yāṭi me dī vīdīḥ V, 2, 1 (594^a)
pūvā tva yāṭi vīḥāṇa mūndam (v) V, 2, 2 (not in Bloomfield as a separate entry)
pūyāṇṭa vīṣam dhīṇṭāḥ tām Indra (v), V, 2, 2 (597^b)
pūvīḥ tātīcā lāyāṭe (v) IV, 1 (598^a)
pīrvāya yāṭi te mīnūḥ (v), IV, 1 (598^b)
pūrvāṇām pūrvāṇāṇa (v), IV, 1 (598^b)

prthivyaparām Vāruṇadāyastamam, V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield)

prthivīmataraḥ śarataḥ svarāś (v), V, 1, 1 (605^b)

prācīana prd ataya (v), IV, 1 (603^a)

Prajāpati idān brāhmaṇa (v), V, 3, 1 (610^b)

prati tana pīti (v), V, 2, 1 (618^a)

prātisṭha hrdayayya sūram (v), V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield)

prāḥa jñāyā Vytrāḥaṇ (v), IV, 1 (623^b)

prā 19 Indraya (v), V, 2, 1 (628^b)

pranāni anuprenkharā, V, 1, 4 (635^b)

pranīya tva (ulīkhami), V, 1, 4 (637^a)

prēmāṇi tacam vadīyanti, &c., V, 1, 5 (641^b), in the parallel passages from Līṭyayana and Śaṅkhayana Bloomfield reads *svargam apī yan* and *svargam iṣyan* respectively, I think wrongly, Ś I, 8 (with variants)

berhātana ||| *(chandasoduhanti)*, V, 1, 4 (348^a)

brāhmaṇa prajāni me dhukta, V, 3, 2 (658^b)

brāhmanā lokē āratram tva iṣyāni bhūyāsam, V, 1, 1 (661^a)

bhūvo vājānāni pātā vāṇāni dnu (v), IV, 1 (670^b)

bhūtīśhyas tva, V, 1, 4 (671^b, 672^a)

bhūr bhūvaḥ svar, I, 3, 2, V, 1, 4 (674^a)

bhūr bhūvaḥ tār śrjyo tādā 'si, V, 3, 2 (not separated in Bloomfield)

māmhīstha Indra vājāni (v) *grmdāhyas* (v), V, 1, 1 (676^b)

māmhīstha vajrinā pīdāse (v), IV, 1 (676^b)

māmhīstha vājānāni (v), V, 2, 2 (677^a, cf RV, VIII, 4, 18^a, 28, 6^a)

mātrā mādāni puruṣāram māghāni (v), V, 2, 1 (678^b)

mana vapurvan vdyur ita ślokaḥkur bhūyā sam, V, 1, 1 (683^b)

mayi kīrtā, V, 1, 5 (689^a)

mayi gāṇā, V, 1, 5 (689^a)

mayi bhāgā, V, 1, 5 (689^b)

mayi bhūktā, V, 1, 5 (689^b)

mayi māhāni, V, 1, 5 (690^a)

mayi yataḥ, V, 1, 5 (690^a)

mayi kīrtā, V, 1, 5 (690^b)

mayi ślokaḥ, V, 1, 5 (690^a)

mayi ślokaḥ, V, 1, 5 (690^a)

mayi ślokaḥ, V, 1, 5 (690^a)

maṛdā lokānam aṣi (v), V, 3, 1 (719^a, treated apparently as prose)

yāś śvāstāḥ śūramāni (v), IV, 1 (769^b)

yam tva śvāstham imāhe (v), V, 1, 2 (762^a)

yāsyedāni arjyat tājō yājō vānam idāḥ (v), V, 2, 1 (two Pādas, in 777^a the first Pāda is given, with the remark that the Aranyaka omits *yujāś*, but the second Pāda is not given under *yujāś*).

yājō vānam idāḥ, see preceding

yē Agnīkīrtā uta va yājatāḥ (v), V, 1, 1 (795^b)

ye yajamāḥ, V, 3, 2 (804^b, without *pāṇi*)

yē māmhīstha māghānam (v), IV, 1 (811^b)

rayāni pūṣṭasāmānāni (v), V, 1, 1 (810^a, cf RV, II, 41, 9^b)

rayi vājāni vājizāḥ (v), IV, 1 (823^b)

Rudras tva tvāstūḥena &c., V, 1, 4 (828^b), Ś I, 7.

lokāni brāhmanavarāsam adbhāyāni yajñāsamvrd dhāni me dhukta, V, 3, 2 (832^a)

tāni M Śatrūḥ, IV, 1 (847^a)

tāni M Śatrū vāṇāni dnu, IV, 1 (847^a)

varāni tva yajātāni &c., V, 1, 4 (848^b), Ś I, 7, oḥ, V, 1, 5 (852^a)

rag dnu iomāya tṛpyāni, V, 2, 2 (853^a)

Vajuh Puṣṭ Vārūṇāḥ Śīmo Agnīḥ (v), V, 1, 1 (860^b)

vādā māghānam vādā gāṇāni (v), IV, 1 (867^b)

vādā māghānam tādāni, IV, 1 (867^a)

vādā rayāḥ tvāstūḥani (v), IV, 1 (867^a)

vīṣṇu gāṇāni geyatā yaj yujatā (v), V, 2, 2 (871^a)

ti va atmāni rajāni (v), I, 4, 3 (not in Bloomfield, perhaps as not being considered a Mantra)

viśvāni dāvan vāṇāni na ś bhāra (v), V, 2, 2 (879^a)

zhoayāni prasthāni dāni (v), V, 2, 1 (881^a, where the whole *hac* with *prasthāni* is given as if one Pāda)

zhoayāni dāni annasthāni &c., V, 1, 4 (886^b)

zhoayāni dāni annasthāni, V, 1, 4 (900^b, where *hac* quotation is given as *annasthāni*)

zhoayāni dāni annasthāni, V, 1, 4 (900^b)

zan me mahanā &c. II, 7 (not in Bloomfield, 853^b) Ś VII, 1
 tadāya ma ahi śilā II, 7 (not in Bloomfield, 903^b) Cf Ś VII, 1
 ita na śamāna bāna (v) (935^a), Ś VII, 1
 śi utam me ma prahāṣi, II, 7 (not in Bloomfield, 940^a)

satyam vadisyāma II, 7 (938^a), Ś VII, 1
 sarvāḥ satyamaḥ śabala utiṣṭhāma (v) (not in Bloomfield)
 sarvāya vaca śama (v) (Cf. supra.)
 samvṛkṣā Sarvavāla (v), (1020^b), Ś VII, 1
 surya pyotasaṁ brūhāḥ (not in Bloomfield, but cf 40^a), Ś VII, 1, IX, 1

In II, 3, 8 the following Ślokas occur

tatra devāḥ sarva eṣam dhāmanāḥ, 1^a, 2^a (391^b)
 tatra devāḥ sarvayujā dhāmanāḥ 3^a (391^b)
 tad viji ya kavya n utindāni 3^a (397^a)
 ita prahmanāḥ prahāya brahmanā, 4^a (433^b)

namajātāḥ samatṛjyāḥ brūte 'dhi, 3^a (547^a)
 nainam aitrīṣumam brūvan 1^b (559^a)
 nainam vaca śrīyam brūvan 5^a (559)

śrūṣṭamāṣam na brūvanam nam 5^a (953^b).

yaḥ caryāḥ kṛuram yaḥ colhanāmi 3^a (735^a)
 yad akṣaram pāṭhanāmi sameti 1^a (749^a)
 yad akṣarād akṣaram śis yuktam, 2^a (749^b)
 yaś vaca om śis yaḥ cā neli, 3^a (759^b)
 yasmin nama samatṛjyāḥ brūte 'dhi, 4^a (773^b)
 yujā yuktā dhi yaḥ samvāhanāḥ, 1^b, 2^a (791^a)

vadāṁ vadāḥ kṛcāna, 5^a (835^a)

satyāḥ satyam amu jatra yujyāḥ, 1^a, 2^a (960^a)
 svargam lokam ayyeti vāṇam, 4^a (1030^b).

Prose formulae in Śankhayana Āranyaka I II VII-XIV (Most of these are not in Bloomfield, I edit Concordance)

annam gṛahīṣi, XI, 8
 annam ita śilāḥ vāṇāḥ kavyāṁ cānāḥ,
 XI, 8
 annāṁ annāḥ dhi jāmam XI, 6, 8
 aśne me vidyāḥ pratīkṣitāḥ svāḥ XI, 5
 aśne me vidyāḥ pratīkṣitāḥ svāḥ aśi loṇe,
 XI, 6
 aśa ita śilāḥ vāṇāḥ svastubhāṁ cānāḥ,
 XI, 8
 arko 'ti Ś I, 7 (113^b)
 aśmā śilāḥ vāṇāḥ jḡgātāṁ cānāḥ XI, 8
 aśmā me brāhma pratīkṣitāḥ svāḥ, XI, 5
 aśmā me brāhma pratīkṣitāḥ ātma aśi loṇe,
 XI, 6
 mīṁ me Paryāyāḥ pratīkṣitāḥ svāḥ XI, 5
 mīṁ me Paryāyāḥ pratīkṣitāḥ svāḥ aśi loṇe,
 XI, 6
 gṛahīṣam nāgratāḥ, XI, 8
 cakṣuḥ ma śilāḥ pratīkṣitāḥ svāḥ XI, 5
 cakṣuḥ ma śilāḥ pratīkṣitāḥ cakṣuḥ aśi loṇe,
 XI, 6
 tat satyam dṛṣṭvā XI, 6, 8
 ityā ita śilāḥ vāṇāḥ svastubhāṁ cānāḥ,
 XI, 8

nāḥ ita śilāḥ vāṇāḥ svastubhāṁ cānāḥ,
 XI, 8
 furuss manāḥ, XI, 8
 Prajāpate ita śilāḥ vāṇāḥ aśi loṇe
 cānāḥ XI, 8
 Prajāpate svastubhāṁ vāṇāḥ pratīkṣitāḥ, I, 7
 prāṇāḥ sūtram, XI, 8
 prāṇe me vidyāḥ pratīkṣitāḥ svāḥ, XI, 5
 prāṇe me vidyāḥ pratīkṣitāḥ svāḥ aśi loṇe, XI, 6
 bala ma śilāḥ pratīkṣitāḥ svāḥ, XI, 5
 bala ma śilāḥ pratīkṣitāḥ balaṁ aśi loṇe XI, 6
 Brāhmar ita śilāḥ vāṇāḥ svastubhāṁ cānāḥ
 XI, 8
 Brāhma ita śilāḥ vāṇāḥ svastubhāṁ cānāḥ
 XI, 8
 manāḥ me cānāḥ pratīkṣitāḥ svāḥ XI, 5
 manāḥ me cānāḥ pratīkṣitāḥ svāḥ aśi loṇe,
 XI, 6
 manāḥ ma śilāḥ pratīkṣitāḥ svāḥ XI, 5
 manāḥ ma śilāḥ pratīkṣitāḥ manāḥ aśi loṇe,
 XI, 6
 mīṁ me aśi loṇe XI, 6, 8
 mūrḍham ma śilāḥ pratīkṣitāḥ svāḥ XI, 5
 mūrḍham ma śilāḥ pratīkṣitāḥ mūrḍham
 aśi loṇe, XI, 6

pat satyasaṃ līka devaḥ, VII, 17 (probably *pat* is not quoted)

raśatani eva sthira vāṣṭhi suvarayena cāṇḍasaḥ, XI, 8

relasi ma nṣaḥ pratisthitaḥ svāḥa, XI, 5

relasi ma nṣaḥ pratisthita rels hrdaye, XI, 6

lūḥmi eva sthira vāṣṭhi anuśāṣṭa cāṇḍasaḥ, XI, 8

evā ma Agnēḥ pratisthitaḥ svāḥa, XI, 5

evā ma Agnēḥ pratisthita Agnir hrdaye, XI, 6

larare me pṛthivī pratisthita svāḥa, XI, 5

larare me pṛthivī prati sthīr larareḥ hrdaye, XI, 6

lrotr me dīśaḥ pratisthitaḥ svāḥa, XI, 5

lrotr me dīśaḥ pratisthitaḥ lrotram hrdaye, XI, 6

Veres other than Rgvēdī in Śāṅkhayana
to XII and XIV are to verses

Agnir eva kṛtani vāḥaḥ purnam, XII, 9^a

Agnē yajāṃ yajāṃ sam arṣaya, XII, 15^a
(Taittiriya Samhita, V, 7, 4 3^a, with the reading *amam Bloomfield, 17^b)

Agnē varcarāṇam karu, XII, 2^a (Atharvaveda, III, 21, 5^a, Bloomfield 25^b)

adṛṣṭya tadāṃ na vyṇāsi yā vṛtham XIV, 2^b
(Nirukta, I, 18^b Comm on Samhitopaniṣad, p. 38 ed. Burdell)

anuvācāmadhyastṛ[ā]vāpārasat, XII, 12^a

anenevā trā vi nirdhā vāḥaḥ, XII, 10^b

anenevā Vṛtram aṇam XII, 30^a (Cf Atharvaveda VIII, 5, 3^a, Bloomfield, 66^b)

anharuṣam eva eva kṛtāḥ, IV, 7 (Vajrasaneyi Samhita V, 43 Bloomfield 70^b)

abha tistha pṛṣṭayataḥ XII, 31^a (91^a)

abhy a vāṛādhvāni nṣa devatagnim XII, 18^a
(Cf Taittiriya Samhita, V, 7, 4 4^a)

amṛtāni me manasī satvāḥ, XII, 32^a

ayam bāḥ nāḥi pater eva astu XII, 12^b (Taittiriya Samhita V, 7, 4 4^b, with 110)

ayam samo na sat eva sapatman, XII, 9^a

ayam samo yā nve vāḥaḥ XII, 10^a

ayam manāḥ pratisarāḥ, XII, 30^a (Cf Atharvaveda X, 3, 3^a 6^a, Bloomfield, 107^b)

ayam evaṇḍi paramasthī anvarcāḥ, XII, 15^a
(Taittiriya Samhita, V, 7, 4 3^a)

alardh namā jīva XII, 19^a

Atimāḥ aṇi nāyāṣam, XII, 33^b

Atimāḥ varaglena eva, XII, 6^a (Atharvaveda, VI, 69, 2^a, IV, 1, 19^a, with 110)

sam deo devyadadh VI, 1, 5 (Śruti Sa 12, XVII, 15, 11 dāyay) (97^a)

sam Prajāpatiḥ pṛṣṭadhāḥ sam akam pṛṇāḥ, I, 8 (98^a)

sam brahman brahmāṇya satṛāḥ, I, 5 (98^b)

sam maham mahatya satṛāḥ, I, 5 (98^c)

sarvam ayur dāyayamudh, XI, 8 (Cf Atharvaveda, XII, 61, 1)

Savitir eva sthira vāṣṭhi sarvate satṛāṇāṃ cāṇḍasaḥ, XI, 8

evam eva sthira vāṣṭhi kṛtāḥ, XI, 8

evam eva sthira vāṣṭhi gayatrena cāṇḍasaḥ, XI, 8

hrdayaḥ hrdaye, XII, 5

hrdayam āṇam, XII, 6

Āranya I, II, VII XIV The references
(Several not in Bloomfield)

ayam vyṇāṣam annam sam vāḥaḥ, XII, 18^a
(Taittiriya Samhita, V, 7, 4 4^a)

Adityaḥ Aditya samam I, 11^a, XII, 1^d

a vāḥaḥ mahat mahat satṛāḥ, XII, 7^d, 34^d (184^a)

a vāḥam janetu XII, 6^a (Atharvaveda, VI, 69, 2^a, IV, 1, 19^a, with 110, 111, 112)

Indra eva Vṛtram pṛṇam XII, 9^b
(Cf 206^a)

Indra (2) eva 2 pṛam vi pṛam viroja, XII, 10^b
(Cf 206^b)

Indram manvanta dvṛṇa pṛam, XII, 13^b

Indra vāḥam pṛam XII, 13^b (Taittiriya Samhita V, 7, 4, 3^b)

manam pṛam annam fit vāḥaḥ, XII, 18^a
(Taittiriya Samhita V, 7, 4 4^a)

evam evaṇḍi deva eva yā devatāḥ, XII, 20^a-27^a

evam evaṇḍi deva eva yā devatāḥ, XII, 20^a-27^a

evam evaṇḍi deva eva yā devatāḥ, XII, 20^a-27^a

evam evaṇḍi deva eva yā devatāḥ, XII, 20^a-27^a

evam evaṇḍi deva eva yā devatāḥ, XII, 20^a-27^a

evam evaṇḍi deva eva yā devatāḥ, XII, 20^a-27^a

evam evaṇḍi deva eva yā devatāḥ, XII, 20^a-27^a

evam evaṇḍi deva eva yā devatāḥ, XII, 20^a-27^a

evam evaṇḍi deva eva yā devatāḥ, XII, 20^a-27^a

gotu afiesu yau yafab, \II, 4^b (Cf gotu afiesu
yau madhu in Atharvaveda, IX, 1, 18^b)

ghritu ullupto madhumam payastan, XII, 7^a,
34^a (160^a)

jajendra sutrun jahi sura dasyam, XII, 11^a

jahyal sapstnan t adhiat tancva, XII, 11^a.

javilo jibaya badhjat, XII, 30^b.

kalah ksatram balam ajat am julam, XII, 16^a
(389^a)

talo diksam piyach svaritah, XII, 16^a (Cf
Taittiriya Samhita V, 7, 4 3)

tad asmai deva abhi nam namantam, XII, 16^a
(394^b with namantu).

tam mayi Prajapatih, XII, 5^a (Cf Atharva-
veda, VI, 69 3^b)

tam mahyati nam ahih sarvam ete XII, 1^a.

tam tva sapatnakrayanama, XII, 19^a

tam palyanti karayah svarandah, XII 31^b

tana ma varcava tvam, XII, 2^a (Cf Atharva
veda III, 22, 3)

tvay pranulita viaghatvanv anutran, XII, 12^a
tvam rudraat ketidhih pravam uah, XII, 13^a

divam yaya divas yaya, V, 15 (Cf RV, \III,
34, 1^a B reads yaya)

divam tva druhatu, XII, 5^a (Cf Atharva
veda VI, 69, 3^d diva dyavi tva druhatu.)

dyavis i: lesik, IV, 7 (Cf Vajassaneyi Samhitā,
I, 43, which has lekhih, Bloomfield, 509^a)

dhanamyo dharuno dharayisauh, XII, 7^b,
34^b (Cf 515^a)

dhiia vidhiia paramola samirē, XII, 17^a
(From Taittiriya Samhitā, I, 7, 4 2^a it
occurs also in RV, \I, 84, 2^b, see Bloom
field, 518^b)

na jambhah nary asuro na yabho, XII, 23^b

na pisharo na gahho na si(m)umarah, XII, 28^b

na mihyam ahi it na hanti sivas, XII, 21^b.

na vrikah na tarahitarayī, \II, 28^a

na tvafadai himati kimsanamam XII, 26^a

na sampatanīyo(?) na virela tasmai, XII, 24^b
na ka kīyam (?) ahnate na kalbasam kīyam, XII,
21^a

na sutika taya gghetu jayate, XII, 25^a.

na saiaho dhavati na jafakīyah, \II, 25^a.

na hasinam krodham upait dhritim, XII, 26^a

nakam et jibnavadi tapajma, XIV, 2^a (Na

nukta, I, 18^a, Comm on Samplutopaniṣad,
p 38 ed Burnell)

naga tva pīrvapadīa bhyan, XIV, 31^a

nadhite dhite vedam ahut tam apānti, XIV, 1^a

nasayan mthas tasya kuletu jayate, XIV, 23^a

n itāhe gramyia tared divasanti, XII, 20^a

nasnam alahisuk kurute nveianam, XII, 24^a.

n itja tvacum himati jutatvedah, XII, 21^a

n itya praya divjati jayamana, XII, 23^a

n ityapavada na pravi dāha ghe, XII, 24^a

nasnam rakto na pāśo himati, XII, 25^a (Cf

Atharvaveda, I, 35, 2^a)

nasnam vyaghro na vrko na āhipi, XII, 26^a.

nasnam sarjo na grdukur himati XII, 27^a

nasnam krtmo ('har') abhi samkale, XII, 28^a.

nasnam krodham manjato 'bhi yanti (?)

XII, 21^a

nasnam dityo Varuno hanti dhritam, XII, 21^b

nasnam framatam Varuno himati, XIII, 19^a

paravarec chivam aismi krtati, XII, 28^a

para suryat paravarah, XII, 19^b (Atharva-
veda, X, 7, 31^b)

parjam tva chinnam tadhābandhanena XII, 19^b.

Prajapatih paramesthi svarasah, XII, 17^b.

(Cf 510^a)

pramoyukam taya dvasantam ahni, XII, 20^a,
19^a

śaitah (śaitah) sahasrauyō u, XII, 33^a.

śrīhad dhatacy ahitam, XII, 2^b (Atharvaveda,
III, 22, 4^b, with ahni'eh)

śrīkhanuizaya ma, havan prīmyatah, XII,
15^b

śkadram palyanta nra sadur agan, XII, 16^a

(Cf 664^b)

mayi tad hastavarasam, XII, 3^d, 4^d (Atharva-
veda, III, 22, 5^d)

mayi bhargu mayi mahah, XII, 5^a (Cf Gopatīa

Brahmana, I, 5, 15, 16, 17, Bloomfield, 699^b,
690.)

mayi yayitaye yad yafab, \II, 5^b

mahiyat lu dīm trī var dhanu, \II, 11^a

mako vighnamā nra yanti (?) mryum XII 14^d

(Cf Atharvaveda, \I 32, 3^d, \III, 8, 21^a.)

mo jib'varam dīdā(?) mī prutidham, \II, 14^d

(Cf Atharvaveda, \I, 32, 3^d, \III, 8, 21^a)

mī te bhavī sram ahani, XII, 33^a.

jac ca vaca va p irata, XII, 3^a (Cf 729^b)
jac ca hastim ahistam, XIII 3^b
yat te varro jatatadāḥ, XII, 2^a (Atharvaveda,
 III, 22, 4^a)
yathā madhumatim vīcam, XII 6^a
yathā sapānan samara saḥyāḥ, XII, 32^a
yat' aśtisu āvanyeti, XII 4^a (Cf 729^b)
yat' Adityaḥ tanyāḥ sambadhāḥ, XII, 1^b (Cf
 Atharvaveda III, 22, 1^b)
yo 'rīhājā it iśāharaḥ bhadrām ānute XIV 2^a
 (Nirukta, I, 18^a, Comm on Samhitopaniśad,
 p 38 ed. Benell)
vyān sapātān ādharamā ca kṛvān XII, 7^a,
 34^a
vāśāḥyam vāśāḥyam āśvayāṣṭam (?) X, 8
vānāḥpale śāstuvāḥ 21 roḥa, IV, 7 (Vajrasaneyi
 Samhitā, V, 43, also in RV III, 8 21^a, &c)
1 itesu nas tigṃajamibho 'nu m irsi XII 9^a
11 vṛśa jātāḥ pṛāḥ kura vṛśa, XII 12^b. (Cf
 Egg^b)
11 vṛśa Indra bhāgāḥ pātāni, XII 15^b (Cf
 Egg^b, 894^b, 895^a)
Vṛtrāni hātvea kṛhijeta [vṛ] vṛśa, XII, 12^b
vṛśāḥ vīṣṭamāḥjanibhāmā, XII, 19^a

śat'iyur asmaiḥ jaramā tak pṛāḥ XII, 22^a
śat'ri yātām a bhārā bhājan 211, XII 10^a (LV,
 V, 4, 5^a, Bloomfield, 916^b)
śrāḥ chātuvāsan kuraḥ kadhāḥām XIV 1^a
śura (?) vāsanāni āharate 'nu yāḥ, XII, 12^a
sapātānam uttamālloko asu, XII 14^a
sapānāḥyānā vṛśa, XII 32^b (970^a)
sam apātānam (?) madhūni pṛyāḥ, XII 6^a
sahāva pṛyāḥyātāḥ, XII 31^b (1004^a)
sāhāḥvā dhūnāḥ saḥāḥvāḥ, XII 31^a
3 uttamāḥ śrā'īkārānam uttamāḥ XIV 1^b
supātānāḥ kuraḥ pṛāḥyātāḥ 211 XII 14^a
surāḥyāni pṛyāḥyātāḥ, XII, 4^a (Cf Atharva
 veda XIV, 1. 34^b)
surāḥyāni pṛāḥyātāḥ XII 3^a
śtāmāni chāḍāḥyāni vṛśāḥ 211 XII, 17^a
 (Taittiriya Samh to V, 7, 4 4^a with *śtā* 11,
 which perhaps should be *śtāmā* 1, but see
 J K A S, 1909 p 430)
śtāḥyāni vṛśāḥ bhārāḥ kuraḥ kṛh 1, XIV, 2^a
 (Nirukta I 18^a Comm on Samhitopaniśad,
 p 38 ed. Benell)
śtāḥyāḥyānam pṛāḥyātāḥ 1 vṛśa vṛśāḥ XII, 1^a
 (Atharvaveda, III, 22, 1^a, with *śtāḥyātāḥ*)

INDEX III

PROPER NAMES, EXCLUDING THOSE OF DEITIES, FOR WHICH
SEE INDICES IV-VI.

Agastyah I 2, 2

Atrayaḥ, II, 2, 1

Āgastyah, III, 2, 1, § VII, 2

Agnividyayanaḥ, V, 3, 3

Arunyaḥ, II, 1, 4

Ārvedīḥ, I, 3, 2, (acc.) III, 2, 3, § VIII, 3,
(gen.) III, 2, 3, § VIII, 3

Ārīṣṭyaḥ, III, 2, 6, § VIII, 11

Ārīṣṭharīṣṭh III, 2, 6 (v l *Ṣarīṣṭh*) (*Ārīṣṭha*
hīṣṭh), § VIII, 10

Ārīṣṭharīṣṭh, III, 1, 6, 2, 2, § VII, 24,
VIII, 2

Ārīṣṭharīṣṭh II, 2, 2

Ārīṣṭh, V, 3, 3

Ārīṣṭh, II, 2, 1

Ceroṣṭh (I), II, 2, 1

Juṣṭh, V, 1, 5, 3, 3 (*Ārīṣṭh*),
§ VIII, 10.

Tarkīṣṭh, III, 1, 6 (v l *Tarkīṣṭh*) *Tarkīṣṭh*,
Tarkīṣṭh I, 5, 2 (*Tarkīṣṭh*), § VII, 29

Dīrghatamasah (gen.), I, 3, 2

Ārīṣṭh, III, 1, 6, § VII, 18

Ārīṣṭh, II, 2, 2

Ārīṣṭh, II, 2, 2

Ārīṣṭh, III, 1, 5 (*Ārīṣṭh*),
§ VII, 15

Ārīṣṭh, III, 2, 3 (*Ārīṣṭh*) § VIII, 3, 4

Bharadvajah, I, 2, 1, 4, 2, II, 2, 1; *Ārīṣṭh*,
Ārīṣṭh, V, 2, 2, *Bharadvajaya*, II,
2, 4

Bharadvajam, I, 2, 2; (acc.) I, 2, 2

Madhuchandah, I, 1, 3, (gen.) I, 1, 3; *Ma*
dhuchandastvam, I, 1, 3

Ārīṣṭh, II, 2, 2

Ārīṣṭh, II, 2, 2, 1, 2, 1

Ārīṣṭh, III, 2, 2, (*Ārīṣṭh*), § VII, 2

Ārīṣṭh, III, 1, 1, *Ārīṣṭh*,
III, 1, 1, § VII, 2, *Ārīṣṭh* (acc.
masc.), III, 2, 6, § VIII, 11

Ārīṣṭh, I, 1, 3, (acc.) I, 1, 3

Ārīṣṭh, II, 2, 1

Ārīṣṭh, I, 3, 2, (acc.) III, 2, 3, § VIII, 3,
(gen.) III, 2, 3, § VIII, 3

Ārīṣṭh (I), II, 2, 1

Ārīṣṭh (I), II, 2, 1

Ārīṣṭh, I, 4, 2, 3, 2, II, 2, 2; 4, *Ārīṣṭh*,
Ārīṣṭh, V, 2, 2

Ārīṣṭh, I, 2, 2, *Ārīṣṭh*, I, 2, 2, (nom.)
§ I, 3

Ārīṣṭh, II, 2, 2, 3, § I, 2, *Ārīṣṭh*, § I, 2

Ārīṣṭh, I, 5, 2

Ārīṣṭh, I, 2, 2, § I, 3, (acc.) § I, 3,
Ārīṣṭh, I, 2, 2

Ārīṣṭh, I, 2, 2, II, 2, 1, § VII, 4, I,
2, (voc.) § I, 6, *Ārīṣṭh*, II, 2, 3,

Ārīṣṭh, II, 2, 4

Ārīṣṭh, I, 2, 2, II, 2, 3

Ārīṣṭh, II, 2, 1

- Śakalyah*, see *Śhāntrah*; *Śakalyasya*, III, 1, 1; Ś. VII, 3.
Śaktarikhyah, II, 2, 4.
Śūratro Māṇḍūkeyah, III, 1, 1; 3; 4 (śan-
 raturo), Ś. VII, 2; 8; 9; 10.
Sāmtadāh, I, 3, 2; (acc) III, 1, 3; Ś. VIII, 3;
 (gen) III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 8.
Śhāntrah Śakalyah, III, 2, 1; 6; Ś. VII, 16;
 VIII, 1; 11.
Hiranyadam Vadaḥ, II, 2, 5.

The following other proper names occur in the *Śākhāyama Āraṇyaka*.

- Ajālatatrum Kāṣyam*, VI, 1; *Ajālatatruh*, VI, 1, 2c.
Atharvaveda, XIV, 2.
Ārunim, III, 1; see also *Uddalaka*.
Āruṇikhyah, VIII, 1.
Uddalakah, *Uddalikaḥ*, XV.
Uddalakah Ārunah, *Uddalakaḥ Ārunah*, XV.
Ulinaretu, VI, 1.
Kāḥṣah Kauṣitakeḥ, *Kāḥṣaḥ Kauṣitakeḥ*, XV.
Aahvāṇḍhetu, VI, 1.
Āpṛajāṇḍhetu, VI, 1.
Kauṣitakeḥ, II, 17, IV, 1; 7, (gen) *Sarvajito*, IV, 7.
Gargya Balaḥ, VI, 1, 2c.
Gṛnabhyaḥ Śonkhayanah, XV; (abl) XV.
Calvatavayāghrapādya, IX, 7.
Gautama, VI, 1; (gen) VI, 2.
Citra Gūṇydyaniḥ (v.l. *Gūṇy*), III, 1, (acc) III, 1.
Janah, VI, 1.
Jirathara(vā)ḥ Ārtadhagnah, VII, 20.
Tāṇḍavind(ān)aya, VIII, 10.
Dṛghah (*Ātmanukhyah*), VII, 2.
Dṛghetama Aṇametyah, II, 17, (dat) II, 17.
Devaratāh, XV, (abl) XV.
Pṛnaratāḥ, VIII, 8.
Paṇḍyāḥ, IV, 2.
Pamharasadeḥ, VII, 7 (cf. Max Müller, *Agveda Pratiśākhya*, p. 6; Punni, VIII, 4, 48).
Pratidityah, XV; (abl) XV.
Pṛyavratāḥ Saumapah, XV; (abl) XV.
Bṛhadāśvrah, XV; (abl) XV.
Bhārgavaḥ, VII, 15.
Magadhavast, VII, 2.
Matyessu, VI, 1.
Mudhyama (*Mānukhyah*) *Magadhavast*, VII, 2.
Māṇḍāyāḥ, VII, 2.
Ṣṣṣṣaravāḥ, IX, 7, XIII.
Radhyaḥ, VII, 7.
Leuḥṣyah (?), VII, 22.
Vat(y)ah, VIII, 3; 4 (*Bṛhadh* in *Āitareya*).
Vaditkhayanah, VII, 21.
Vatvamamah, XV; (abl) XV.
Vyotvah, XV, (abl) XV.
Śastakhrigṛah, IV, 6 (cf. Śānta Sūtra, XI II, 2, 13).
Śvetaketum, III, 1.
Satyakama Juhvah, IX, 7.
Satvamanatyaesu (so Max Müller and Cowell, *S B E.*, I, lxxvii for *satanmatyaesu*; more probably *sataśa*, as Oldenberg), VI, 1.
Sahamavah, XV; (abl) XV.
Samitayah, XV; (abl) XV.
Sūryaratāḥ, VII, 5.
Somepah, XV, (abl) XV.
Saumak Pratidityah, XV; (abl) XV.

INDEX IV

WORDS OCCURRING IN VERSES OTHER THAN RGVEDIC, NIVIDS, PRAISAS, ETC

(When the case or gender is ambiguous, it is nom. or masc. unless otherwise specified)
Words are given in their forms as found. Prefixes are connected with the verb, unless words intervene.)

A In Astaveya Āraṇyaka and parallel passages in Śūkhyaṇa Āraṇyaka.

- dhṛitam*, V, 3, 2
agula, V, 1, 1, *agnā* 3, IV, 1
agnyaśodh, V, 1, 1
diti (with acc.) IV, 1, V, 2, 1
atichandasa, V, 1, 4
adruah, IV, 1
dhavyādh, IV, 1
dhāryādh, V, 2, 1 (prob. w. r. for *dhāryādh*)
dnu (with acc.), IV, 1, V, 1, 1
dnādh, V, 3, 2
antarekṣam, V, 1, 1
annam, V, 1, 1
annasubhā (f), V, 3, 2
anydin, IV, 1
āparyatam (acc.), IV, 1
āpanam, V, 1, 4, *āpanaya*, V, 1, 4
āpāram, V, 1, 1
āpratisvadaḥ, V, 3, 2
abhiṣyam (acc. neut.), V, 3, 2
abhiṣiddhiḥ, IV, 1
anum, V, 1, 5
anurkṣādh, V, 2, 2
antam, V, 3, 1, (acc.) ib. (gen.) ib.
ayudaktaram (nom. or acc. neut.), V, 3, 2
arkṣu, V, 2, 2, *arkṣādh*, V, 2, 2 (perhaps w. r. for *surkṣādh*)
ārc *arcanti*, V, 2, 2
arcādh, V, 3, 2
āru *arata*, *arataḥ*, *arantu*, V, 1, 1, *arut*, V, 1, 1
aravāḥ (acc. masc.), V, 2, 2
āra *ara*, V, 1, 5, 2, 2, 3, 2, *āra*, V, 2, 2, *aru*, I, 3, 4
āra *aranyate* (f. *aranyate*), IV, 1
ārah, V, 1, 1, 5, *āra*, I, 7, *arasa*, I, 4, 3
āra, V, 1, 1
āra, IV, 1, (with loc.) V, 2, 1
āra, V, 1, 2, (instr.) V, 1, 3
aradyādh, V, 1, 1, 4, *āra*, I, 7
aravastubhāḥ, V, 1, 4, *āra*, I, 7
āra *aravastam*, V, 3, 2 (the ref. to *aravastam* is corrected in Whitney, *Roots*, 6th ed., pp. 248, 249), *aravastam*, V, 1, 1
aravādh, V, 1, 1
aravādh, IV, 1
aravastam, V, 3, 2
aravādh (acc.), V, 3, 2
aravādh (f), V, 2, 1 (perhaps w. r. for *aravādh* (f))
āra *imake*, V, 2, 2, *āra*, V, 1, 1, *aravādh*, IV, 1
āra, V, 2, 2
aravādh, V, 1, 1, 2, 1, (acc.) V, 1, 1, 2, 2
aravādh, V, 2, 1
Indrak, IV, 1, V, 1, 1, 2, 1, 2, 3, 1, 2, (acc.) V, 1, 1, V, 2, 2, (dat.) V, 2, 2, (gen.) V, 2, 2, (voc.) V, 2, 2, with *pluti* V, 1, 1
Indragrāhām, V, 3, 2 (accent dubious)
aravādh, V, 1, 1, 5, *aravādh*, V, 1, 5
aravādh, V, 1, 1
aravādh, V, 2, 2, *aravādh*, IV, 1
aravādh, III, 2, 5, V, 2, 2, 3, 2
aravādh *aravādhāḥ*, *aravādhāḥ*, *aravādhāḥ*, V, 2, 4
aravādh, V, 2, 3
aravādh *aravādh*, I, 3, 4
aravādh *aravādh*, I, 3, 4, *aravādh*, V, 2, 2, *aravādh*, III, 2, 5

na, V, 2, 1; 2, (of comparison) III, 2, 5 (dub , see nakulī)
 nāh (acc.), IV, 1; (dat.) V, 1, 1, 2, 1, 2;
 (gen.) IV, 1, V, 2, 1.
 nakulī (?), III, 2, 5.
 naksatrah, V, 1, 1.
 namah V, 1, 1
 natyam (m or n), IV, 1
 √na abhi naya, IV, 2, *supra* III, V, 2, 2
 (dubious use and accent)
 nandam IV, 1, V, 2, 2
 nr̥tamah, V, 2, 2
 netāram, V, 2, 1.
 pakrah, V, 1, 2
 √pat patiyantim, V, 1, 5
 patib, V, 2, 1, (voc.) IV, 1.
 paulam, V, 2, 2
 pīrah, V, 3, 2
 paravāntīh, V, 2, 1
 pavib, III, 2, 5
 patiā, V, 1, 1
 pai klena, V, 1, 4
 pūdrah, V, 1, 1
 √piu pinvati, V, 3, 2 (accent dubious)
 √pih piba, IV, 1, pīha, V, 1, 1
 pīdngasamīdram, V, 2, 1 (v l *sadyam)
 pīvarim, V, 2, 2
 pūcham, V, 1, 2
 pūnarbhīh, V, 1, 1, *bhuvah, V, 2, 1.
 pūv, V, 2, 1, 2
 pūrvodram, V, 2, 2
 pu nvaio, IV, 1
 √puṣ pūṣyanti, V, 2, 2
 pūrih, IV, 1
 pīrvam (nom neut), V, 3, 2, (gen masc)
 IV, 1
 pūrvindam, IV, 1
 pūrvikūtam, V, 1, 1
 Pūś, V, 1, 1, Pūśi 3, IV, 1
 √pr par at, IV, 1.
 prīhau, V, 1, 1
 prīhnyuparām, V, 3, 2 (accent and reading
 dubious).
 Prīnmatarah, V, 1, 1
 prakid, V, 2, 2 (v l uprakid)
 prā itama, IV, 1
 prayām, V, 3, 2
 Prayipatib, V, 3, 2

prati (with acc.), V, 2, 1.
 prānīh, V, 1, 2; 3, 2
 prābhūh, V, 1, 1 (v l prābhūh); (voc) IV, 1.
 prābhūh (v. l. prābhūh), V, 1, 1.
 prāstāh, V, 2, 2 (more prob pra + √stāh).
 prāndh, V, 1, 5, 3, 2; (acc) V, 1, 4, 3, 2,
 (dat) V, 1, 4, 3, 2, (gen.) V, 3, 2
 prīyah, V, 2, 1
 bahu (acc.), V, 1, 5; (abl) V, 1, 5, Ś I, 8
 bhāratna, V, 1, 4
 bhr̥dt, IV, 1, V, 2, 2; bhr̥ate (name of Saman),
 V, 1, 2
 Br̥hāspatib, V, 1, 1.
 br̥dhma, V, 1, 1, (acc) V, 3, 2, (voc.) V, 3, 2.
 br̥hmanavartaidam (acc.), V, 3, 2
 br̥hmanandhārtīram (nom. neut.), V, 3, 2
 (accent dubious)
 √bru san-bravatyahai, IV, 1.
 bhagah, V, 1, 5
 bhadrīya (name of Saman), V, 1, 2
 bhargah, V, 1, 5
 bhūktah, V, 1, 5
 bhūyah, V, 1, 5
 bhavah (undecl.), V, 1, 4, 3, 2
 √bhu bhuvah, IV, 1, bhūyām, V, 1, 2, bhū-
 idam (acc. neut.), V, 1, 1, bhūteśhyah (dat.),
 V, 1, 4, bhūtam (nom. neut.), V, 3, 2
 bhūtyah, V, 3, 2
 bhūyah (acc.), V, 1, 5, Ś I, 8
 bhūh (undecl.), V, 1, 4, 3, 2
 √bhū bhūra, V, 2, 2
 bhūryam, V, 3, 4
 bhūtyah, IV, 1, V, 2, 2; 2, (voc) IV, 1
 bhūdhm, V, 2, 2, (dat) V, 2, 1
 bhūdhm, IV, 1, bhūdhm, IV, 1.
 √mā matva, IV, 1, matva, V, 1, 1.
 madam, V, 2, 1.
 madhu V, 1, 1
 mādhumat, V, 2, 2
 √mā mānyu, IV, 1 (accent dubious)
 māh, V, 1, 2, (gen) 3, 2, (instr) V, 1, 5,
 (abl) 3, 2
 mānyu, IV, 1.
 mānyu, V, 1, 1
 Mārīyah, V, 1, 1
 √mā māh māh, V, 2, 2
 mādhm, V, 1, 5, māh, V, 3, 2, māh, V, 3, 2

śarma (acc.), V, 1, 1

śvaś, V, 2, 1

śvartakāḥ, IV, 1, (acc.) V, 2, 2; (voc.) IV, 1.

√śams dūṣṇantīśaḥ, IV, 1, śaṣṭi, IV, 1
(accent doubtful)

śāradhāḥ, V, 2, 1.

√śikḥ śikṣa, IV, 1.

śiraś, V, 2, 1

śīraś, IV, 1, (gen. plur.) IV, 1.

śrīḥ, V, 1, 3, (acc.) V, 3, 2, śrayam, V, 1, 1.

√śru śrutāḥ, V, 2, 2

śrūtram, V, 1, 3, 2, (gen.) V, 3, 2

ślokaḥ, V, 1, 3

ślokaśūḥ, V, 1, 1

śā, IV, 1; V, 2, 1, 2

śāmrataḥ, V, 3, 2

śākhā, IV, 1

śatyām, V, 3, 2, śatyāsammitam, V, 3, 2 (accent
dubious)

√śan śanīṣyanti, V, 2, 5

śandī, V, 2, 2

śaśā, V, 1, 1.

śāśru, V, 3, 2

śani, V, 1, 3

śamayāḥ, V, 2, 1

śāśāśvaś, V, 3, 2

śāśvam (nom. neut.), V, 3, 2, (acc. neut.) V, 3,
2, śāśvasmat (neut.), V, 3, 2, śāśvan, V, 3,
2, śāśvasyat (gen.), III, 2, 3

śāśm, V, 3, 1

śāśā, V, 2, 1

śāśmadhāram, V, 3, 2 (nom. or acc. neut.)

śāśye, IV, 1

śāśatūḥ (?), V, 2, 1.

√śac śāśāśīśatūḥ, V, 1, 1 (dubious accent).

√śau śūśā, V, 2, 1

śāśaruaḥ, V, 1, 5

śāśmā, IV, 1

śāśīyam (acc.), IV, 1.

śāścūḥ, IV, 1

śāśādī, V, 1, 1.

śāśāśā (or voc. I), V, 1, 1.

śāśyāḥ, V, 1, 1

√śay śayam, V, 3, 2.

śāśā, V, 1, 1; 2, 1; 2, 2, 2, (gen.) V,
3, 2

√śtu śtute, IV, 1 (or śtinī)

√śtubh śtubhāśa, V, 2, 2, śtubhāśa, 1b

śtobhāḥ, V, 1, 5

śtamaḥ, V, 1, 5

√śrī śrīśī, V, 2, 2.

śrīśāḥ (acc.), IV, 1.

śrām, V, 1, 1, śrām, I, 3, 4

śrā, Ś 1, 4, 3, 2, (acc.) V, 1, 5

śrāśī, V, 2, 2

śrāśāḥ, V, 1, 1, and perhaps 2, 2

√śan aśhānaḥ, V, 1, 1

śī IV, 1, V, 2, 2.

√śi śinīśī, V, 2, 2

√śu śāśamaśī, IV, 1

śāśāśāśā, V, 3, 2.

śāśāśāśāśā, V, 3, 2 (accent dubious)

B In Śākhayana Āranyaka and the Śānti verses in the Aitareya Āranyaka (A)

ākamaḥ, XI, 8

ākṣetu, XII, 4

Agnī, XI, 6, XII, 9, (acc.) V, 1, 18, (loc.)
XI, 5, 6

ājām (acc.), XIV, 1

Aitharīyānam, XIV, 1

aiśa, XII, 19

Aditya, XII, 1, Adityas (abl. or gen.), XII, 1.

adhāraṇ, XII, 7, 34

adhīpatiḥ, XII, 18

amuvadī, XII, 10

antariśāśam (acc.), IX, 7

anukam, XI, 8

anukam, XI, 6, 8

anukam, XI, 6, 8

anyat (nom.), XII, 11

aparīśam, XII, 15

aparīśāśī, XII, 24

aparīśā, XI, 6, (loc.) XI, 5

aparīśā, XII, 12

aparīśam, XII, 31

ayāḥ, XI, 8

ayam, XIV, 2, amena VII, 1, XII, 10, 30,

A. II, 7, amena, XII, 25, ayam, XII, 27, 30,

amena, XII, 24

ayāśī, XII, 31

ayāśī, I, 7.

ayāśam, XIV, 2

ayāśāśāśī, XII, 2

ayāśī, XII, 20

alaksamā, XII, 24

alardāḥ, XII, 19 (of doubtful form and meaning, cf perhaps *avata* (*Lex*), *avata* (AV) but perhaps it may be from *√r* (cf *alata*, RV, VIII, 48, 8), for *alata* (like *avāta*, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, p 442 Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p 120, n 50, the tensils becoming a media (cf Macdonell, p 32) and meaning 'active one' Or *alaya*?)

√au *avata*, VII, 1, A II, 7.

√ai *ainata*, XII, 21, XIV, 2

√ai *aliya* XI, 8, *afata*, XII, 24 (doubtful, the MS reading is *niyātarām lalāmāḥ pratisṭhāḥ*, and I amend to a *ata* to give sense and metre)

aina, XI, 8

ainam, XII, 4

aiyaman XII, 33

√as *ai*, XII 33; *asū* VII, 1, XII, 15;

A II, 7, *isthāḥ*, A II 7

asū XIV, 1, *istam*, XII, 18

asuraḥ, XII 25

asām, XII 35

asvatardā, VII, 1, A II, 7.

atāṣāḥ XI, 2, 6, *ani*, A II 7

atichandarena XI, 8

atni, XI, 6 (loc) XI, 5, 6

Adityāḥ, XII 1

anurūpāḥ XI 8

asāḥ XI 5, 6

ayinā (acc) XI, 8

ayutman XI 8

avakaraḥ § 1, 7

aviravir, VII, 1, A II 7 (*avir*, in second case)

ahāḥ, XII, 20, 29, XIV, 2

√i *eti*, XIV, 2, *pratis* XII 2 *adhite*

XIV, 1, *adhīya*, XIV, 2, *adhiteṇa* (neut),

VII, 1, A II 7, *śamāyaya*, XII 15

Imāḥ XI, 5, 6 XII, 9, 10, 30, (voc.) XII, 31

Indraṇatim XII, 15

iramānini, XII 20-29

iva XI, 8, XII, 9 10, 29

istam VII 1, IX, 1, A II, 7

iḥa, XII, 15

iḥāḥ *preukhāyatu* I, 7

Ikamāḥ, XI, 5, 6

uttama lakaḥ, XII, 15,

uttamangam (acc), XIV, 1

ulāṣak, XI, 6, (loc) XI, 5, 6

uparistat, XII, 12

usasaḥ (abl), XII, 19

vidm, XIV, 1

viṣm (acc), VII, 1, A II, 7. (3 nom) VII,

1, A II, 7

viṣmā, XII, 30, *viṣayāḥ*, XII, 16

vyāḥ, XII, 15; 29. (The older form is

angāḥ, and this may best be read here)

vyāḥ, XII, 16

anurūpāḥ, XI, 8

lakṣmī, XII, 9.

lakṣmīḥ, XII, 14 Cf *Inl Stud*, VIII, 264, n

lakṣandham (acc), XIV, 1

lakṣyāḥ, XII, 32

lakṣmīḥ, XI 8

laka, XII, 10, XIV, 2

lakṣmī XII 21

lakṣmī, XII 11

lakṣmī, XII, 23

√kr *kurata*, XII, 29, XIV, 1, *krnati*, XII,

28, *kurū*, XII, 2, *krnām* XII, 7, 54,

krām, XII, 16

krmāḥ (abl), XII, 28

√kṛ *kṛpata*, XII, 20

√krudh *krudham*, XII, 21, 26.

kratam XII, 16

√gu *agun* (3rd SS °an), presumably a plural

form of the imperfect of *gu* as a second

class verb (cf Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*,

§§ 845, 622, but if so a late form. The other

texts have *agur*), XII, 16 *agur*, XII, 32 (in

both cases probably with true nonst effect)

gṛatrena XI, 8

grāḥ, XII 24 *grāṇi*, XII, 25 +

gṛāṇi XII, 8 4

√grath *udgratham* XI 8

grāmīḥ, XI, 8, (acc.) XI, 8

grāmāḥ, XII, 28

ghṛtāḥ, XII, 7, 34

caṣṭak, VII, 1, IX, 1, A II, 7, XI, 6, (loc)

XI, 5, 6

- pitacāḥ*, XII, 25
putra (with abl.), XII, 29
putra, XII, 9
putraḥ (acc.), XII, 10
putram, XII, 29
√pu putrapanuyam XII, 4
putrapādūdhayam (1° padādhyaṁ), XII, 31
putanah, XII, 20
putanayataḥ (acc.), XII, 31.
putanyataḥ (gen.), XII, 15, (acc.) XII, 31
puthivī XI, 5, 6
puthukā, XII, 27
putya XII, 23
Putraputah, I, 7 B, XI, 8, XII, 17
putrastham XII, 14
putrasarūḥ, XII, 30
√putrāḥ putrakalam, XII, 3.
putrayanyam XII, 20, 29
putradāhah (†MS *putradāhā*), XII, 29
putrah, XII, 6, (loc.) XII, 5, 6
√pādāḥ padāhyate, XII, 30.
padāhanama XII 29
palam, XI, 6, XII, 16, (loc.) XI, 5, 6
palakama XI, 8
palakā XII, 33 (v 1)
palak XII 2
palakavayāḥ, XII, 1
Palakavayāḥ XI, 8
palakam, XII, 20-29, *palakāḥ*, 27, 33 (v 1)
palakam I, 5, XI, 6, 8
palakamantitaya (masc.), XII 25
palakamaya I 5
palanguḥ XII, 14
palakam (acc. neut.) XII, 16, XIV, 2
palagah XII, 5, VII, 1, A II, 7
palatu XII, 33
palakavayāḥ, XIV 2
√palāḥ palāyam, XII, 21.
palāyam (f), XII, 26
√palāḥ palāyam XII, 2 *palāyam* VII, 1, A II, 7, *palāyam*, XII, 1, *palāyam* XIV, 2
(palāyam tvaḥ avastā avastā), *palāyam* (masc. neut.) VII 1, A II, 7
√palāḥ palāyam, XII, 20-29, *palāyam*, XII, 10, *palāyam* XII, 9
palāyam (acc.), XII, 10
palakarah XII, 22
palakatan, XII, 15
palakāḥ, XII, 30, 32, (acc.) XII, 20-29, (loc.) XII, 33
√palāḥ palakam, XII, 29
palakam, XII, 6
palakamam, XII, 6; *palakamam* XII, 7, 34
palakam, XII, 12
√palāḥ palakam, XII, 12
palakāḥ, VII, 1, XI, 1, 6, A II, 7; (loc.) VII 12, XI, 5, 6, A II, 7
palakam, XII, 30
palakavayāḥ, VII, 1, A II 7
palakavayāḥ, VII, 1, A II, 7
palakāḥ, XI, 6, (loc.) XI, 5, 6, *palakāḥ*, XII 21
palakāḥ, XII, 3, 4, 5, VII, 1
palakāḥ, XII, 12
√palāḥ palakam, XII, 6 (doubtful read ng perhaps imperative (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 618) the sense may be, 'may the *palakam* gladden me with honey meat, O Agni,' but I read *palakam*)
palakāḥ, XII 5, 14 (if so read, the sense must be 'hindering their greatness', but the other version, *palakāḥ*, is better)
palakāḥ I, 5, *palakāḥ* (neut.), XII, 7, 34, *palakāḥ*, I 5
palakamam XII, 13
palakāḥ (f), XII, 14; *palakamam*, XI, 6, 8
palakam, XII, 33, *palakāḥ* (f) IX, 7, *palakam* (f) VII 1, A II 7, *palakāḥ*, VII, 1, IX, 1
A II, 7, palakāḥ, A II, 7
palakam XII, 22
palakāḥ XII 23, 14 (f)
√palāḥ palakam, XII, 22
palakamamam, XIV, 2.
palakam, XI, 6 XII, 15, (acc.) XII, 1, (loc.) XI, 5, 6
√palāḥ palakam, XI 6, 8
√palāḥ palakam, XII, 9
palakam XII, 14
palakāḥ XII, 10
palakāḥ *palakam*, XII, 4
palakāḥ, I, A II, 7.
palakāḥ, XII, 25
palakam XIV, 1
palakam, XII 5
palakāḥ *palakam*, XII, 6, 1. *palakāḥ*, XII, 5.
palakāḥ (masc.), XII, 2, 3
palakāḥ, XII 4, 5, *palakāḥ*, XII, 15.

yajastva, XII, 15

✓yā annyaśu, XII, 12, abhikṣmī (abhi-
iśte B, which can hardly be right), XII, 21,
upayānti (jati B), XII, 24

rakṣa, XII, 25

rajaśam, XI, 8

✓rabh i anuramrabhauṣam, XII, 18

rūtram (acc), XII, 17

✓ris vītam, XII, 33, vītanām, XII, 13

✓ruv vī ruroja, XII, 30, ruvam XII, 7, 34

rudraś, XII, 13

✓ruś āroha, XII, 7, 34, iroha I, 7,

āroha I, 7 Cf abhyarūḥam, X, 8

ruśa, XI, 6, (loc) XI, 5, 6

ruśāyām X, 8 (Cf Śaṅkhāyana Śrauta Sutra,
VIII, 28, 3)

✓rup ulluṣṭaś, XII, 7, 34

lohau, XI, 8

✓vad avadimī, XII, 6, vadīyamī, VII, 1,
A II, 7

vana (acc) XII, 11.

vanaiśate IX, 7

Vartuś XII, 21, 29

varcas, XII, 2, 3, (instr) XII, 2.

varcarīnam XII, 2

varīhanīu XII, 13

✓vas vīsam XI, 8, vajrasam VII, 1, *ā-
dhana, A II, 7

✓vaumati XIII, 1 (not in Chandogya Upan-
ishad, III, 11, 6 and from Jacob's *Concordance*
apparently foreign to the Upanishads)

✓vāś avāśa XII, 15

vī XII, 3

vuk VII, 1, XI, 6, A II, 7, (acc) XII, 6 (in-
str) XII, 3 (loc) XI, 5, 6, V II, 1, A II, 7

vakīram VII, 1, A II, 7

vakyam (acc) XII, 20

valīu XII, 9

vajuh XI, 3, 6

vajīnam (acc) XII, 18

✓vad vīda, XII, 19

vadyuśa XI, 5, 6

vadhāt XII, 17

vīśamābhājamābhāsam, XII, 19 (the reading
seems certain)

vīśaś(?) XII, 15

✓vuk, XII, 25

✓vāś i abhikṣartadīvam, XII, 18

✓vātram, XII, 9-11, 30.

vāśaś, XII, 28

vāś, XII, 32

vāśam, XIV, 1, 2, (gen) A, II, 7, vāśaś
mātarīmī (7), V II, 1

vāśāyena (so rather than *yaśa*), XI, 8

vāśāś, XII, 26

vāśa, VII, 1, A, II, 7 (error for *yūśa*)

✓vāśaś am, vī, pra, praśaśaś, XII, 18
(exact readings are doubtful)

✓vāśaś IX, 7

✓vāśaś, XII, 23

✓vāśam, XII, 11

✓vāśāśam, XII, 10

✓vāśam, VII, 1; A, II, 7

✓vāśaś vāśam, XII, 21 (vāśam A, B)

✓vāśam, XI, 6, (loc) XI, 5, 6

✓vāśaś, XII, 28

✓vāśam, XII, 11, 19

✓vāśaś (acc) XIV, 1.

✓vāśam (acc neut.), XII, 28

✓vāśaśam, X, 11

✓vāśaś, XII, 11, 13

✓vāśam, A, II, 7

✓vāśaś, VII, 1, IX, 1, A, II, 7

✓vāśam, XI, 6, (loc) XI, 5, 6

✓vāśam, XII, 26

✓vāśam (acc neut.), XIV, 2

✓vāśam (nom) XI, 8, (acc) VII, 1, A, II, 7

✓vāśaśam, VII, 17

✓vāśaś vāśam, XII, 16

✓vāśaś, XII, 17

✓vāśaś, VII, 1, A, II, 7 (vāśaś for *vāśaś*)

✓vāśaśam, XII, 31, (acc) XII, 19

✓vāśaśam, XII, 7, 32, 34, &c.

✓vāśaś, XII, 32

✓vāśaśaś, XII, 24 (vāśaś - na must be merely
a strong negative since *vāśaś* hardly can
be taken as 'misfortune'; I read *vāśaśaś*)

✓vāśaś, VII, 1, A, II, 7

✓vāśaś, XII, 27

✓vāśaśam, XI, 8

✓vāśam (acc vī vāśaś), XII, 1, vāśaś, XII, 18

✓vāśaś, XII, 32

✓vāśaśaś, XII, 31, vāśaśaś, XII,
32, vāśaś, XII, 30 (vāśaś might be = *vāśaś*,
but this is unlikely)

- śāha* (with instr.), XII, 29
śāhastauryaś, XII, 33
śāha, XII, 9
śamnan, XIV, 1
śamrajyena, XI, 8
śamghena, XII, 6
Śaviraś (I), XI, 8
śam, XI, 8
śafarnaś, XII, 14
śamghāḥ, VII, 1, A II, 7
śurayaś, XII, 4
śurvarāś, XII, 17
śurvarman, XI, 8, (loc.) XII, 3
śufiśa, XII, 25
śītram, XI, 8, XII, 33
śuryaś, XII, 19, *śuryaś* VII, 1, IX, 1, A II, 7
śīva śafarvata, XII, 18
śatlagāś (MSS *śat*), XII, 23
śamghāyaya, XII, 7, 34
śonam, XII, 17
śīkḥ: *śāhastīśa* XII, 31 *śatīśīśaś*, °ś,
śaś, śā XII, 5 and 6 *śatīśīśaś*, VII, 1,
 A II, 7, °śaś, VII, 1, A II, 7
śīkḥmaś, XIV, 1
śīkḥraś, XI, 8
śīkḥīśīś, XII, 11
śvarvataś, XII, 16, 31
śmarajyena, XI, 8

śhan *śant*, XII, 21, *śāhastīśaś*, XII, 28,
śhan, XII, 30, *śāh* XII, 11 *śat*, XII,
 11, *śāhīśaś*, XII, 10, *śīkḥmaś*, XII, 14
 (Boughananaś which with *śāh* and *śrāyāś*
 might conceivably = 'the might of persons at
 variance (a gen. in *śaś*) goes to destruction'
 but the *ś* must be wrong)
śastīśaś, XII, 26, *śastīśaś*, XII, 3
śastīśaśaś, XII, 1 &c
śha *śāhīś* (I), XII, 11, *śraśīśaś*, A II,
 7
śhan *śhan* XII, 25, 27, *śhan* (*śhan*
śhan), XII, 22, 26, *śhan*, VII, 1, IX,
 1, 7 A II, 7
śhan XII, 4
śrāyāś, XI, 6, (loc.) XI, 6
śatīśīśaś, XI, 13

INDEX V

WORDS OCCURRING IN ĀRAṆYAKAS I-III, OTHER THAN WORDS OCCURRING IN QUOTATIONS.

(When the case or gender is ambiguous, it is nom. or masc. unless otherwise specified. See also p. 344. As II 2 and 6 have no *ābandas*, the II is repeated where necessary to avoid ambiguity. Parallel words in the Śaṅkhayana Aranyaka I, II, \ III are referred to as §.)

- aś* II, 2, 2.
antaphalāham, I, 2 2.
āharah, II, 3, 6, III, 2, 3, § \ III, 3.
akṛimāḥ, II, 1, 5.
akṣa vna, II 2, 2, 1, 8, III, 1, 5, (acc.) II, 3, 8, (acc. du.) III, 1 3, § VII 10, (nom. plur.) I, 3 4, 7, (acc. plur.) III, 2, 2; § VIII, 2, (instr. plur.) I, 3, 8, (gen. plur.) II, 1, 4, 3, 8, III, 2, 2, § VIII, 2, (loc.) § VIII, 4.
akṣarasamīpanaḥ, III, 2, 2, § VIII, 5, (acc.) III, 2, 1, § \ III, 5.
akṣini, II, 4, 1, (acc.) II, 4, 2, III, 2, 4, § \ III, 7, (abl. with *ī*) II, 4, 1.
akṣaḥ, I, 2, 2 (collar-bone). Cf. *akṣom* and *akṣaḥ*, § II, 4 (also in the Bodleian MS).
agnih, I, 4, 1, 2, II, 2, 1, 5, 7, 4, 1, 2, III, 1, 2, § VII, 1, &c., (acc.) I, 1 2, II, 1, 1, III, 2, 4, § \ III, 6, (gen.) I, 3, 8, II, 1, 7, III, 2, 4, 5, (loc.) III, 2, 3, § \ III, 4, (abl.) § \ II, 8.
agnihotram, II, 3, 3, § X, 1, 8, (acc.) § X, 8.
agram, I, 3, 3, 4, 1.
agra, II, 4 1, III, 2, 1, 3, § \ II, 2, (with abl.) II, 5.
agṇyaḥ, I, 1 5.
aham, II, 5, (nom. plur.) I, 2, 2, (abl. plur.) II, 5, (gen. plur.) I, 4, 1, II, 3, 5, *ya* *akṣaḥ* *nr*, § I, 5.
angulayāḥ, I, 1, 2, 2, 2, III, 2, 5, § \ III 9.
angulīḥ, § II, 5.
āśac *pratyajantī*, I, 4, 1.
āśay *vyayamaus* II, 3, 6.
anaharam, III, 2, 6 (*rite naharam*, § \ III, 11).
anān, II, 4 1. Cf. *anda*.
anśajanti, II, 6.
ataḥ, I, 3, 4, 4 2, II, 1, 2, III, 2, 4, § \ III, 7.
ate (with acc.), II, 3, 3, § I, 4.
atithik, I, 1, 1.
atithymene, III, 1, 3, § \ II, 8, 9.
atta, II, 1, 2.
atru, II, 1, 2.
atrayam, II, 1, 1.
atra, I, 3, 8, 4 1, 3 1, II, 5, III, 1, 1, § VII, 2, &c.
atha, I, 1, 1, &c., § \ II, 2, &c.; *atha karmat*, I, 2, 2, 5, 2, *atha kṣaḥ*, II, 4, 3, *athatīk*, I, 4, 1, II, 2, 2, 7, III, 1, 2; 3, 6, 2, 5.
atho, I, 1, 2, 3, 4, 4 2, 5, 1, II, 1, 6, 3, 6.
ād *atta*, II, 1, 2, 3, 1, *ādanti*, II, 3, 1.
āḥṛit, *āḥṛaḥ*, II, 1, 2, *ādama*, II, 4 2, *āḥṛaḥ*, *āḥṛa*, II, 1, 2.
Aditiḥ, III, 1, 6, § \ II, 15, *Aditisamīdā*, § \ II, 15.
addhataman, I, 2, 3.
adhastat, II, 4, 1.
adhi (with acc. and *āśac*), II, 1, 1 (with loc.) II, 3, 8 (a *śloka*), (with loc. and *āśacatī*) II, 1, 1.

- adhi lai valam*, I, 3, 3; 8; II, 1, 2, &c., § VII, 2, &c.
adhipatsh, II, 3, 7, (acc) II, 3, 7
adhyatnam, I, 3, 3, II, 1, 2, &c.; §, \ II, 2, &c.
adhyañam, III, 2, 6, § VIII, 11.
adhivaryatsh, III, 1, 3, § VIII, 4
adhu samantam, II, 1, 2, *adhipramitam*,
adhipramitam, II, 4, 3; *adhipramya*, II, 4, 3.
adnakamamitsh, II, 3, 8.
adnakatavim, III, 2, 6.
adnakatsh, see *adac*
adnyah, I, 5, 1.
adnakatsh, II, 1, 5
adnu (with acc), I, 4, 1, II, 1, 2, 7, 3, 1, 3;
 (adv) II, 1, 7.
adnakatsh, see *adac*
adnakatsh, III, 2, 3; § VII, 4
adnakatsh (v 1), II, 3, 1
adnakatsh, III, 1, 4, § VII, 8
adnakatsh, I, 1, 1, &c., (acc) I, 1, 2, &c., (nom
 plur) II, 1, 5, § I, 2, (loc plur) II, 1, 5.
adnakatsh, I, 1, 2, *adnakatsh*, I, 1, 1, *adnakatsh*, II, 3, 6, *adnakatsh*,
 II, 3, 5
adnakatsh, III, 2, 6, § VIII, 11
adnakatsh, I, 1, 2
adnakatsh, II, 3, 6, (acc) II, 3, 6
adnakatsh, III, 1, 5
adnakatsh, I, 3, 2, 3
adnakatsh, I, 1, 2, &c., § II 10, &c.
adnakatsh (with loc), I, 5, 1, § II, 11
adnakatsh, III, 2, 4 (adnakatsh, § VII, 1)
adnakatsh, II, 1, 2, &c., (acc) II, 1, 2, &c.,
 § VII, 10, (gen) II, 3, 7, III, 2, 5, § VIII,
 8, (loc) III, 1, 2, § VII, 3
adnakatsh, I, 2, 3, 4, 3, (acc) I, 4, 3;
 II, 3, 3, (loc) I, 4, 3
adnakatsh, III, 1, 3, § VII, 10
adnakatsh, I, 3, 5
adnakatsh (with acc), I, 2, 3, 5, 2; III, 1, 2,
 5, § VII, 11, 12, (with gen.) § VII, 3
adnakatsh, I, 5, 1
adnakatsh, II, 2, 1 (adnakatsh, §
 VII, 1)
adnakatsh, I, 1, 3, &c., § XI, 7, (acc) I, 2, 4,
 II, 4, 2, (instr) II, 1, 2, III, 2, 4, (gen)
 II, 1, 2, 4, 3; (loc) II, 3, 1, (nom plur)
 II, 3, 1, *adnakatsh*, I, 4, 1.
adnakatsh, I, 1, 3
adnakatsh, I, 1, 2; II, 3, 1; (nom neut) II, 3,
 1; (acc masc) II, 1, 2, 3, 1; (nom 1st
 II, 3, 1, *adnakatsh*, I, 2, 4
adnakatsh, I, 1, 2; 2, 3, § I, 7, (acc) I, 1, 2,
 2, 4, II, 1, 7, (dat) I, 4, 2, (gen) I, 1, 4,
 2, 3; 3, 8, § I, 7, (gen plur) I, 4, 1
adnakatsh, I, 1, 2; II, 1, 2, § VII, 10
adnakatsh, II, 4, 1
adnakatsh (with abl), I, 2, 2; *adnakatsh*, I, 3, 2,
adnakatsh, II, 3, 2, III, 2, 1, *adnakatsh*, II, 4, 3,
 (with abl) III, 1, 3, § VII, 8, 9, *adnakatsh*
 (neut), III, 2, 4, *adnakatsh*, § XI, 8, *adnakatsh*
 (neut), I, 3, 2, *adnakatsh*, III, 1, 1; § VIII,
 1, *adnakatsh* (acc), III, 2, 3, *adnakatsh*, II, 1,
 4; *adnakatsh*, III, 4, 1
adnakatsh, II, 3, 7; III, 1, 6, § VII, 18.
adnakatsh, I, 2, 4, *adnakatsh*, I, 2, 4
adnakatsh, I, 1, 4, 4, 3, *adnakatsh*, I, 4, 2.
adnakatsh, see *adnakatsh*
adnakatsh, I, 2, 3
adnakatsh, I, 2, 2 (probably *adnakatsh*, ablative,
 or perhaps *adnakatsh*, dative)
adnakatsh, I, 1, 4
adnakatsh, II, 1, 5, 2, 1, 3, 3; 4, 1, 1, § X, 8,
 (instr) II, 1, 8, 4, 3, (gen) III, 2, 5, §
 VII, 8, (loc) § XI, 1
adnakatsh, II, 3, 3
adnakatsh, I, 3, 4, II, 1, 4, 3, 3, III, 2, 5, *adnakatsh*,
 III, 1, 2, § VII, 3, *adnakatsh*, § XI, 8 In II,
 3, 3 *adnakatsh* most probably goes with *adnakatsh* and
 in III, 2, 5 with *adnakatsh*
adnakatsh, III, 2, 6, (*adnakatsh* B) § VIII, 11
adnakatsh, I, 3, 4
adnakatsh (with acc) I, 4, 2, (adv) II, 3, 5,
adnakatsh (with acc), see *adnakatsh*
adnakatsh, I, 2, 2, &c.
adnakatsh, II, 3, 2
adnakatsh, II, 1, 8
adnakatsh, II, 3, 6
adnakatsh, I, 4, 2
adnakatsh, III, 1, 3, 4, § VII, 7, 8
adnakatsh (acc), I, 3, 1
adnakatsh, II, 2, 4
adnakatsh, II, 2, 2
adnakatsh, II, 1, 8, 5, 6, *adnakatsh*, II, 1, 8,
adnakatsh, II, 1, 8, (acc masc) I, 3, 8, (acc
 neut) I, 3, 8, II, 3, 2.
adnakatsh, § XI, 1
adnakatsh, III, 2, 4 (*adnakatsh*, § VIII, 7)

- c *th* i, II, 3, 6
gini, II, 4, 2, 3, XI, 4, *gī-ah*, II, 6, *gī*,
 III, 1, 6, *ś* V II, 19, *gā* (gen.), *ś*
 VI, 4
gayatram, I, 4, 1, II, 3, 4, *ś* VI 7, (acc.)
 I, 1, 3
giyatrī, I, 1, 1, &c., *ś* II 7, (acc.) I, 4, 3,
 5, 1, *ś* II, 8, *giyatrā* (nom plur.), 3, II,
 10, *giyatrāḥ*, *ś* I, 2, (loc plur.) I, 4, 1,
gīrā, II, 1, 8
gūh, I, 1, 3
gṛ *grāh*, II, 1, 8, *agṛāh*, III, 2, 4 (acc
grāh *ś* XI, 4), *grāhī*, II, 1, 4
grāhī, II, 2, 1
gṛh *grāhantī*, I, 2, 4, *anud-grāhantī*, III, 1,
 2, *ś* V II, 3, *agṛāhantī*, II, 4, 3 *grāhī*
hantī, II, 4, 3, *grāhī*, II, 4, 3, *agṛāh* at,
 II, 4, 3
gṛhī, II, 3, 6
gṛh, II, 1, 6
gṛhāntī, II, 1, 6
grāhā, II, 4, 3, *grāham*, *ś* II, 17 Cf *agṛā*
hantī, *ś* II, 17
grīh, I, 4, 1 *grīhī* am, *ś* II, 3 Cf *grī* w i,
ś II, 3, and *mayurā*.

gṛh *ajgrāh*, II, 6
gṛhī, I, 1, 4
gṛhā, II, 2, 4, *gṛhī*, II, 2, 2
gṛhī, III, 2, 4, *ś* V III, 7, which has *agṛā*
hantī

ga, I, 1, 4, &c., see Introd. p. 65 *ś* VII and
 VIII agree with the *Ashteya*
agṛā *acā* nī, I, 4, 1 II 1, 4, 6, 8, 2,
 1, 2, 4, 3, III 2, 5 *ś* VII, X, 1, &c
akā, I, 3, 8, &c., *ś* VII, 3 &c (acc.) II,
 1, 7 *ś* X, 4 (instr.) II, 1, 7, 4, 3, (abl.)
 II, 4, 1, (gen.) II, 1, 7, III, 2, 5. (nom
 du.) II, 3, 8
akāsurī *ayā*, *akāsurī* *ayā*, III, 2, 1, 2, 3,
ś VIII 1, 2
akāsurā, III, 2, 3, *ś* VIII, 3, *akāsurā*, I, 1,
 2, *akāsurā* (acc.), *akāsurā* (loc.), *ś* II,
 10 *akāsurā* *akāsurā*, *ś* II, 11
akāsurī *akāsurī* (instr.) III, 2, 2 *ś* VIII 2
akāsurī *akāsurī*, II, 3, 6, (acc.) *ś* II, 10
akāsurī, III, 2, 1, *ś* VIII, 1

akāsurī *akā*, I, 2, 2
akāsurī *akā*, I, 1, 2, 5, 1, 2, 5, 1,
akāsurī, II, 1, 5, 2, 4, 1, 2, III, 2, 4,
ś V III, 7, &c., (acc.) *ś* V, 5, XI, 1;
 (gen.) II, 1, 7; (loc.) III, 2, 3, *ś* V III,
 4, &c
akāsurī *akāsurī*, II, 1, 6, *akāsurī*, II, 1, 7; *akā*
surī, II, 1, 7, *akāsurī*, II, 1, 7, *akā*
surī, I, 1, 1
akāsurī, III, 2, 5; *ś* VIII, 9
akāsurī *akāsurī*, II, 3, 3
akāsurī, III, 2, 4
akāsurī *akāsurī*, II, 2, 7, *akāsurī* *akāsurī*, II, 1, 8,
akāsurī, III, 2, 4; *ś* V III, 6, *akāsurī*,
 II, 3, 8
akāsurī *akāsurī*, III, 2, 6, *ś* V III, 11,
akāsurī, II, 3, 2, (gen.) II, 3, 3
akāsurī, III, 2, 4, *ś* V III, 7
akāsurī, I, 1, 2
akāsurī *akā* (proper name), II, 1, 1
akāsurī *akāsurī*, I, 2, 2, *akāsurī*, III, 1,
 3, *ś* V II, 10

akāsurī *chān*, II, 1, 6, *chān*, II,
 1, 6
akāsurī *chān*, I, 2, 3, *akāsurī* *chān*, *ś*
 XI, 3
chān (nom.), I, 4, 1; 8, 1, *ś* I, 1, (acc.)
 I, 1, 2, 3, 8, (loc.) I, 1, 2; (nom plur.) I,
 2, 2; 3, 4, II, 1, 6, 3, 4, *ś* II, 8, (acc.
 plur.) III, 1, 6, *ś* VII, 18, (instr plur.) I,
 3, 4, II, 1, 6, 3, 5, III, 2, 6, *ś* V III,
 1, (gen plur.) I, 4, 1, II, 1, 1, 3, *ś* II,
 5, (loc plur.) I, 3, 4, (nom du.) *ś* I, 2
chān *chān*, III, 2, 3, *ś* VIII, 3
chān *chān*, I, 1, 1 for the form of *na*
chān, *ś* I, 5, *chān*, *ś* *chān*, *ś* *chān*
chān, p. 71
chān *chān*, I, 5, 2
chān *chān*, II, 3, 4
chān *chān* (acc.), II, 1, 6
chān *chān*, III, 2, 3, *ś* VIII, 4
chān *chān*, *chān* *chān*, III, 2, 1, 2, 3,
ś VIII, 1, 2, *chān* *chān*, *chān* *chān*,
 I, 3, 4
chān *chān*, II, 2, 4, *chān* *ś* VIII, 7
akāsurī *chān* *chān*, *chān* *chān*, I, 2, 4
chān, III, 2, 4, *ś* VIII, 7, *chān*, III,

2, 4 *chidra*, 5 V III, 2, (nominal) *chidra*, 5 V III, 9
churukena, I, 2, 4
jagati, I, 3, 4, II, 1, 6, *jagatisahasram*, II, 3, 5
jaguriam, II, 6
ajana jayate, I, 2, 2, II, 1, 2, (*adhrva jayate*, *a-jayate*) 3, 1, 1, *prajayate* I, 2, 4 &c., *prajayate*, I, 2, 4, *prajante* I, 1, 1, 8, II, 1, 7, *ajayate*, II, 4, 3, *prajate*, II, 3, 6, *prajate*, I, 3, 4, *prajayate*, II, 5
janma II 5, (gen.) II, 5
ajap japat I, 3, 2, III, 2, 4, 5, 5, I, 4, *japate* II, 1, 4
jigatam (acc. neut.), I, 1, 3, (nom.) 5 V I, 2, *jagati* 1, 1, 3
jagatam I, 1, 2
jagadagam, I, 5, 3, *vedagam* I, 5, 3
jyasa III 1, 6, 5 V II, 16, (acc.) I, 3, 5, *jyagata* 5 V I, 8
jyagata II 6
ajasa 5 *adhrva*, I, 2, 2 &c., *ajasa jayate*, 5, V III
jihma III, 2, 4 (*adhrva* 5 *ajasa* 5 V III, 7)
jihma *prajata* III, 2, 4, 5, V III, 7
jahva III 2, 1
ajasa jayate I 5, 2, *jyagata* III 2, 4, 5, V III, 7, *prajate* 5 V I, 8, *jyagata* (gen. masc.) 5 V I, 8
jyagata *am* (acc.) II 3, 8, (instr.) II 3, 8
jyagata (acc.) II 3, 8, (instr.) II 3, 8
jyagata II 6
ajasa jayate II 1, 7
ajasa jayate, II, 6, III 2, 5 (*ajasa jayate* 5 V II, 12), *prajayate*, II, 3, 5, *prajayate* I, 2, 2, *prajayate* II, 2, 3, *adhrva* *prajate* II 4, 2, *prajate* (acc. neut.), II, 3, 2, *prajate* III 2, 4, 5, V III, 2, *prajate* *am* *ca*, 5, I 6
jyagata, I, 4, 2
jyagata (acc.) III, 1, 1, *jyagata*, I 3, 4, 7
jyagata, II, 3, 1, (acc.) II, 1, 7, (nom. plur.) II, 3, 1, II 6, III, 2, 2, 5 V II, 1
ajasa jayate (gen. masc.) III 2, 4 (*jyagata* 5 V III, 7), *jyagata*, III 2, 4
makata III 2, 6, 5 V III, 11
makata *adhrva*, III 2, 6, 5 V III, 11, (acc.) III, 2, 6, 5 V III, 11

lat (nom.), I, 1, 2, &c.; *latam*, I, 1, 2, &c., *latam*, I, 2, 2, II, 3, 6, *lat*, I, 1, 1, &c., *lena* (masc.), II, 2, 4, *latya* (neut.) II 1, 2, *latya* (gen.) I 2, 2, 3, 4, II 3, 6, *latyam* (instr.), II, 3, 1, *lat* (nom.), I, 4, 1, 2, II 2, 4, *le* (nom. neut.), I, 1, 2, *le* (acc. fem.), II, 4, 2, *latya* (gen. masc.), II, 3, 6, *le*, I, 1, 1, &c., *lat*, I 1, 2, &c., *latam*, I, 1, 2, II 1, 1, *lat* (acc.) I, 3, 5, *latya* (dat.), II, 4, 2, (abl.) II 4, 3, *lat* (=so, then) I, 1, 1, &c., *latam* (=therefore), I, 1, 1, &c., *latam* (=therefore), I, 2, 2, 4, II, 2, 3, *lat yad*, I, 2, 3, 4
 See also *Introd.*, V I, p. 58

latam I, 3, 3
latamam (acc. neut.), II 4, 3
latam, II, 2, 4
latamam I, 1, 3
latprajate *prajate*, I, 1, 2, &c.
latam II, 2, 6 III 2, 5
latamam, III, 2, 5, 5 V III, 9
ajasa jayate, *prajate*, II 2, 5, *sanit*, II, 5, *sanit*, I, 4, 3 *latamam*, II, 4, 1
latam II 1, 6, *latam* II, 2, 6
latamam *adhrva* II, 1, 6
latamam III, 2, 5, 5 V III, 9
latamam, II, 3, 6, *latam* 5 V I, 4
ajasa jayate, I 2, 4, II, 2, 2, 2, *adhrva* *prajate*, II 4, 1, 3, *prajate* II 2, 3, *adhrva* *prajate* II 4, 1, *prajate* (abl.), II, 4, 3
latamam, I 2, 2, *latam* I, 2, 2
latamam, III, 2, 5, 5 V III, 9
latam I, 2, 3
latam I 1, 8, II, 1, 7, *latam*, II, 2, 4, 3, 8, (acc.) I, 5, 2
latam, II, 3, 6
latamam, I, 2, 4
latam I, 1, 2, &c.
latam II 1, 8
latamam III 1, 6, 5, 5 V II, 18, *latamam*, 5, II, 5
latam, I, 1, 1, *latam*, I 1, 1, *latam*, 5, II, 1, *latam*, II, 2
latamam, I 4, 3, (acc.) I 4, 3, (nom. plur.) II 3, 4, (abl. plur.) II, 3, 4
prajate II 2, (adv.) II 2, 3
ajasa jayate, I, 2, 2, *adhrva* *prajate*, I, 2, 2

- śrīp* + *śamotṛp*; au, II, 2, 8, *śamotṛpāt*, II, 4, 3, *śrīpāt śamotṛpāt*, X, 1, &c., *śrīpāt*,
śa, *śam*, *śak* (m and f) X, 2 sq
śepā, I, 1, 3, 2, 2; (acc) II, 5, (loc.) I, 2, 2,
śepāni, I, 1, 3.
śrī *śrayatā*, II, 2, 1
śrayā, I, 1, 1, &c., *śrayā* ḥ, I, 2, 2, II, 1, 1,
 3, 4; *śrayā*, I, 1, 2, 2, 3, II, 3, 3, 4, III,
 1, 2, *śrayā* (nom.), I, 3, 4
śrīmat, I, 1, 2.
śrīmatyā, I, 2, 2.
śrī, I, 1, 1, &c.
śrīmatkām (acc neut.), I, 5, 2
śrīmat, I, 5, 3
śrīmat, I, 4, 1, II, 1, 5, (name) II, 3, 4, *śrī-*
mat, I, 1, 2, &c.
śrīmat, I, 1, &c., ḥ I, 2, (acc) I, 2, 2, &c.,
 (nom plur.) ḥ I, 2.
śrīmatyagayā, I, 5, 2, (gen. plur.) I, 5, 2;
 (loc plur.) I, 5, 2
śrīdhā, II, 3, 4, b, II, 2
śrīmatkām, I, 2, 2, ḥ I, 2, *śrīmatkām*
 (nom.), ḥ VI, 7, (acc) I, 1, 3, (instr) ḥ
 II, 1.
śrīmatkām, I, 3, 4
śrīmat, II, 1, 4, 2, 3, *śrīmat*, II, 2, 2, *śrī*, III,
 1, 3, *śrīmat*, I, 3, 4
śrīmat, I, 4, 1, II, 2, 6, 4, 1, (acc) II, 4, 2,
 (instr) II, 4, 3, (abl) II, 4, 3
śrīmatkām, I, 3, 4 (from Rgveda)
śakunak, I, 4, 2, II, 3, 4, ḥ II, 5, *śak* ḥ
nam II, 2, 3, *śakunak* (nom.), I, 2, 3
śakunakān, III, 2, 4, ḥ XI, 4
śāy *śāyeta*, II, 3, 6 (with instr)
śāyā, I, 2, 3
śāyaprasavānam, II, 3, 3
śāyā, I, 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, with *śāyā*, II, 2,
 4, *śāyā*, II, 3, 4
śāyā, I, 3, 8, II, 3, 4
śāyānam, I, 5, 2.
śāyā, I, 3, 7, *śāyānam*, I, 4, 1.
śāyānam (nom neut.), I, 7, 7
śāyā, I, 3, 4, *śāyānam* (instr), I, 4, 2
śāyā *śāyā*, II, 2, 3, *śāyā* I, 1, 4, *śā-*
yā, II, 2, 6, ḥ XI, 8, *śāyā*, II, 1, 5, *śā-*
yā, I, 1, 4, *śāyā* (nom neut.), II, 3, 4
śāyā, *śāyā*, II, 2, 6
śāyā (nom plur. fem.), I, 2, 3
śāyānam, S. VII, 10 (*śāyānam*, A
 III, 1, 3)
śāyā (fem.), I, 3, 4
śāyā, II, 1, 6, *śāyā* (nom.), II, 1, 5; 7, 2, 3,
 4, 1, 2, ḥ VII, 4, X, 6, (acc) II, 1, 1,
 6, ḥ X, 6, *śāyā* (abl), II, 1, 7, *śāyā*,
 II, 1, 7.
śāyā *śāyā*, III, 2, 4, ḥ VIII, 7.
śāyā *śāyā*, I, 2, 2; *śāyā*, I, 2, 2.
śāyā *śāyā*, I, 4, 1 Cf J R. A. S. 1909, p. 204
śāyā *śāyā* (3rd sing.), I, 1, 2
śāyā *śāyā*, III, 1, 4, ḥ VII, 5
śāyā *śāyā*, II, 4, 3.
śāyā *śāyā*, I, 1, 1, and see *śāyā*
śāyā *śāyā*, II, 3, 1, III, 2, 4, *śāyā*,
 I, 2, 3, *śāyā*, III, 2, 4, *śāyā*,
 III, 2, 4 (*śāyā*, S. VIII, 7), *śāyā*, II,
 1, 3; 8, *śāyā*, II, 4, 2, *śāyā* (nom
 neut.), II, 4, 2, *śāyā*, III, 2, 4, ḥ VII,
 7, *śāyā*, II, 4, 3
śāyā, II, 6, *śāyā* (acc), ḥ XI, 3
śāyā, II, 3, 4, *śāyā*, I, 1, 4, II, 1, 2, 4;
 3, 8, 2, 1, 2, 1, 8, 6, *śāyā*, II, 1, 8,
śāyā (dat), I, 1, 4, (abl) II, 1, 8, *śā-*
yā, I, 4, 3, II, 1, 2, III, 2, 6
śāyā, II, 1, 8, III, 1, 3, *śāyā* III, 1, 4,
śāyā (dat), II, 4, 2, *śāyā* (nom),
 I, 3, 2, 8, II, 1, 5; 3, 3, ḥ XI, 1, (acc)
 II, 2, 4, ḥ XI, 1, *śāyā*, II, 4, 2
śāyā *śāyā*, II, 2, 4
śāyā *śāyā*, II, 2, 8, (abl) ḥ I, 8
śāyā or *śāyā* (f), I, 2, 4
śāyā (acc), I, 1, 8
śāyā, I, 3, 1, *śāyā* (gen.), I, 3, 1 (w t for
śāyā)
śāyā, I, 4, 3, *śāyā*, *śāyā*, III, 2, 5, ḥ
 VIII, 9, *śāyā* (gen., v l), I, 3, 1.
śāyā, III, 2, 3, ḥ VIII, 3, (acc) ḥ
 VIII, 7
śāyā, I, 2, 2
śāyā, I, 2, 3, II, 1, 2, 7, 4, 1, III, 1, 1,
 2, 2, 4, ḥ VII, 2, &c., *śāyā*, II, 4, 1,
 III, 1, 3, 6, ḥ VII, 15, &c., *śāyā*, ḥ X,
 4, *śāyā* (gen.), II, 1, 7, III, 1, 2, 2, 4,
 S. VIII, 8, *śāyā*, III, 1, 2, 3; 2, 3, ḥ
 VII, 3, &c.
śāyā *śāyā*, III, 1, 2; ḥ VII, 1, (acc)
 III, 1, 2, *śāyā* *śāyā*, I, 3, 8 (from
 Rgveda), *śāyā* (gen f), ḥ VII, 3

- [illegible]

śaśko, II, 1, 6
śaśmā, II, 1, 4; (acc.) I, 1, 2, 2, 2; 1, 4;
 II, 1, 8, 3, 8; (abl) II, 2, 1, (gen) I, 2,
 3, cf. *apahatīśaśma*
śayāsam (acc.), III, 1, 4; Ś XI, 4.
śayukh, III, 2, 4, Ś V III, 7
śata, II, 1, 7, III, 1, 6, Ś V II, 15; *śataram*,
 II, 1, 7, *śata*, III, 2, 6, Ś I, 1, *śatukh*, II,
 1, 7, III, 1, 1, Ś V II, 2
śaśikāśhāśh (abl), I, 3, 8, II, 1, 6
śśib *śibam*, II, 1, 4; *śibati śayayati*, Ś
 V, 1, &c
śumanāsam, II, 3, 8, *śumāsā*, I, 4, 2
śucham, I, 4, 2, II, 3, 4, (instr) I, 4, 2
śumśirakam, see *śha*²
śunyan, II, 1, 7, (dat neut) II, 1, 7, (dat
 plur neut) II, 5
śutrah, III, 1, 1, 5, 6, Ś VII, 2, &c.,
 (instr) III, 1, 1, Ś VII, 2, (gen) II, 1, 7,
 III, 1, 1, Ś VII, 2
śutrl III, 1, 1, 2, 3, Ś V III, 2, &c
śunak, II, 1, 4, 2, 2, *śunak śunak*, Ś V I,
 8, *śunak*, Ś XI, 1, *śunarmśhum*, XII
śuvāśai, I, 2, 4, 3, 2, 1, 1
śura (adv), III, 2, 3, (with abl) II, 1, 5, Ś
 XI, 3 (*śuvāśarāś*)
śuruś, I, 1, 2, 3, 5, 4, 1, 2, II, 1, 2, 3,
 4, 2, III, 1, 2, Ś VI, 3, (acc.) I, 3, 8,
 4, 1, II, 1, 4, 4, 2, 3, III, 2, 3, Ś XI, 1,
 (gen) II, 1, 7, 3, 1, (loc) II, 3, 2, 7, Ś
 X, 1, (nom plur) II, 6, III, 2, 3, Ś V III, 3
śuruarīśham, I, 4, 2, (instr) II, 2, 1
śururīśham (gen), II, 2, 1, 3, 8, 2, 1, 1, 17
śutūś, I, 1, 1
śurūśham, I, 1, 1
śurūśham, I, 1, 1
śurūśham, II, 1, 6, (acc) II, 3, 6
śśu śuvāśai, I, 2, 3, *śśuśuvāśai*, II, 2, 2,
śśuśuvāśai, III, 1, 6, Ś V II, 14, (instr)
 III, 1, 6, Ś V II, 19
śśuśuvāśai, III, 1, 2, 2, Ś V III, 2
śurūśham, II, 1, 1, *śurūśham* (acc.) Ś II, 1
śurūśham, III, 1, 1, &c., Ś VII, 2, &c.
śurūśham (acc.), III, 1, 5, Ś V II, 12
śśu śurūśham, II, 3, 6
śśuśuvāśai, II, 1, 2, 7, 3, 1, II, 6, III, 1, 2,
 Ś V II, 2, &c (acc) III, 1, 3, Ś V, 2, &c;
śśuśuvāśai, Ś V, 2, *śśuśuvāśai* (gen) V, 1, 7,

III, 1, 2; Ś V III, 8; *śśuśuvāśai*, III, 1, 2;
 Ś V II, 3
śśuśuvāśai, III, 1, 3; Ś V II, 10
śśuśuvāśai, I, 2, 1, *śśuśuvāśai*, Ś II, 1
śśuśuvāśai (acc), I, 1, 3, (nom) Ś I, 2, &c.,
 (gen plur) I, 2, 1.
śśuśuvāśai (acc), II, 1, 7
śśuśuvāśai, I, 2, 1; *śśuśuvāśai* (abl), Ś
 II, 10
śśuśuvāśai, III, 1, 6, Ś V II, 16
śśuśuvāśai, I, 3, 4, Ś V II, 15, (acc) I, 3, 4, &c.,
 (instr) I, 2, 4, &c., Ś V II, 2, &c.; (nom
 plur) II, 1, 1, 2, (acc. plur) I, 2, 3, III,
 2, 6, (gen plur) II, 1, 2
śśuśuvāśai, I, 4, 1, *śśuśuvāśai*, I, 2, 4, 2, 1, 4;
 4, 1.
śśuśuvāśai, I, 4, 2
śśuśuvāśai, I, 1, 4, 2, 2, 3, 1, 5, II, 1, 2,
 6, 1, III, 2, 6, Ś I, 1, II, 17, VII, 11,
 &c., XI, 7, (gen) I, 1, 2, II, 1, 2, (loc)
 Ś I, 2
śśuśuvāśai, III, 1, 6, Ś VII, 16.
śśuśuvāśai, I, 1, 1.
śśuśuvāśai, III, 2, 4
śśuśuvāśai, III, 2, 3, Ś VIII, 3, *śśuśuvāśai*
śśuśuvāśai, Ś V III, 7, *śśuśuvāśai*, II, 6
śśuśuvāśai, II, 6, (instr) II, 3, 2, (gen) II,
 6, (loc) II, 6.
śśuśuvāśai, II, 6, (nom neut) II, 6
śśuśuvāśai, II, 2, 9.
śśuśuvāśai (with acc), III, 2, 3, 4
śśuśuvāśai, I, 3, 1, 2, 3, Ś I, 1; II, 17, fol-
 lowed in both cases by *śśuśuvāśai*
śśuśuvāśai, I, 2, 1, 5, 2
śśuśuvāśai, I, 1, 3, &c., Ś II, 18, *śśuśuvāśai*
 (dat) I, 1, 2, *śśuśuvāśai* (abl) I, 2, 4;
 (loc) Ś I, 7; *śśuśuvāśai* (nom), I, 5, 1,
śśuśuvāśai (gen), I, 4, 2
śśuśuvāśai, I, 4, 2, V, II, III
śśuśuvāśai, III, 1, 3; Ś V II, 10; (acc) III,
 1, 3, Ś V II, 10, (gen) III, 1, 3, Ś V II, 10
śśuśuvāśai, I, 3, 2; 5, 2
śśuśuvāśai, III, 2, 4, Ś XI, 3
śśuśuvāśai, I, 2, 4, *śśuśuvāśai*, I, 2, 4, *śśuśuvāśai*
 I, 2, 4, 2
śśuśuvāśai (nom neut), I, 1, 3; 8, II, 1,
 (acc. masc.) I, 1, 2, (acc. fem.) I, 3, 3, (instr
 fem.) I, 2, 2, &c., (acc. da. neut) I, 3, 7
śśuśuvāśai, I, 3, 3

- grad'm it*, II, 1, 1.
grad'sametre, I, 2, 4.
grad'side, II, 1, 4, (instr) II, 1, 4.
grad'sat'ah, III, 1, 6, § VIII, 11.
gr'asama, I, 2, 1.
grast'avanah, III, 1, 1, § VII, 2.
grah'idam, II, 1, 5.
grak (with abl), II, 3, 3, 4.
gr'm *grak*, I, 2, 4.
graj'apatyam, I, 2, 2, § I, 1.
gr'ana, I, 2, 7, 8, II, 1, 4, 3, 6, III, 1, 1, 4, 6, 2, 6, § VII, 8, &c., (= smell) II, 4, 1, 2, (acc) II, 1, 3, III, 1, 6, 2, 6, § VII, 8, &c., (*gr'andam*) II, 3, 5, (instr) I, 4, 1, &c., II, 1, 6, &c., III, 1, 6, (abl) II, 4, 1, (*gr'andut*) II, 3, 6, III, 2, 2, § VIII, 2, (gen) II, 1, 7, III, 2, 3, § VIII, 8, (loc) II, 1, 4, III, 1, 6, 2, 6, § VIII, 11, (nom plur) I, 1, 2, 2, 4, 3, 7, 8, II, 1, 2, (acc) I, 4, 2, (instr) I, 5, 2, (gen) I, 3, 8.
gr'ana'ah'st (nom neut), II, 3, 2, *gr'mah'h'st'ah* (nom plur), II, 3, 2, (acc plur) II, 3, 2.
gr'ana'st'ana'yah (loc), II, 3, 3.
gr'am, I, 3, 4.
gr'idar, II, 1, 1.
gr'at'urbh'avanti, III, 2, 4, § VIII, 7.
gr'eyah (with gen) I, 2, 2, (rem) III, 2, 3, *gr'eyya* *gr'eyya*, § XI, 8.
gr'ey'hah, I, 2, 3, (acc) I, 2, 4, (gen) I, 2, 2.
gr'ey'hah'ti, I, 1, 3.
gr'ey'hah'ti, I, 3, 5.
gr'halaham, *gr'halake* *gr'halat'm*, I, 2, 3.
gr'halam, II, 3, 6, (acc) I, 2, 4, II, 3, 6.
gr'hanah *gr'hanah'ti* (sem) I, 4, 1.
gr'hanah'ti, III, 2, 4, (*gr'hanah'ti*, § VIII, 7, XI, 3).
gr'hanah'ti, II, 2, 4.
gr'hanah'ti, III, 2, 6, § XI, 2, *gr'hanah'ti*, § XI, 2.
gr'hanah'ti, III, 1, 2, § VIII, 3.
gr'hanah'ti, I, 1, 2.
gr'hanah'ti, I, 2, 3, *gr'hanah'ti*, II, 3, 6.
gr'hanah'ti, I, 5, 3.
gr'hanah'ti, III, 2, 3, § VIII, 4.
gr'hanah'ti *gr'hanah'ti*, II, 3, 7.
gr'hanah'ti (nom), § II, 5, XI, 7, (acc) I, 1, 3, *gr'hanah'ti*, *gr'hanah'ti*, I, 4, 3, § II, 2, 9, *gr'hanah'ti* (abl), § II, 10, *gr'hanah'ti*, § II, 17.
gr'hanah'ti, I, 1, 2, *gr'hanah'ti*, I, 1, 4.
gr'hanah'ti, III, 1, 2, § VII, 3, *gr'hanah'ti*, § II, 3.
gr'hanah'ti *gr'hanah'ti*, II, 2, 2.
gr'hanah'ti *gr'hanah'ti*, I, 1, 6, *gr'hanah'ti* *gr'hanah'ti*, II, 3, 6, (instr) II, 1, 6, *gr'hanah'ti* *gr'hanah'ti*, II, 3, 6, (acc plur) III, 2, 2, § VIII, 2, (instr plur) § II, 9.
gr'hanah'ti *gr'hanah'ti* (sem), I, 3, 2, *gr'hanah'ti* *gr'hanah'ti* (nom), § II, 17.
gr'hanah'ti *gr'hanah'ti*, II, 2, 4, &c., § II, 17, (acc) II, 2, 3, (gen) II, 2, 4, &c., § II, 17.
gr'hanah'ti *gr'hanah'ti* (gen), III, 2, 6, *gr'hanah'ti*, § VII, 19.
gr'hanah'ti, II, 1, 2.
gr'hanah'ti, I, 1, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 8, II, 1, 2, 3, 8, § I, 5, &c., (acc) II, 4, 3, § I, 5, XI, 2, (last) I, 1, 2, 3, 2, 2, III, 1, 6, &c., I, 5, (= spell) II, 3, 8, (gen) I, 3, 1, I, 1, 3, *gr'hanah'ti* *gr'hanah'ti*, III, 2, 3, § VIII, 4.
gr'hanah'ti, III, 2, 3 (probably the masc. here denotes 'a Brahman priest', § VIII, 3 has *gr'hanah'ti*, *gr'hanah'ti*, III, 2, 3 (certainly = priest), § VIII, 2. Cf p. 304.
gr'hanah'ti, II, 1, 8.
gr'hanah'ti, I, 5, 2.
gr'hanah'ti *gr'hanah'ti*, II, 2, 4.
gr'hanah'ti *gr'hanah'ti* (acc), I, 1, 3, (instr) III, 1, 1, &c., § VIII, 2, &c.
gr'hanah'ti *gr'hanah'ti*, I, 1, 2.
gr'hanah'ti *gr'hanah'ti*, III, 2, 3, § VIII, 3.
gr'hanah'ti *gr'hanah'ti*, I, 3, 4, § VIII, 8, 9, *gr'hanah'ti* *gr'hanah'ti*, III, 2, 4, *gr'hanah'ti* *gr'hanah'ti* (dat), III, 1, 3, § VII, 3, &c., *gr'hanah'ti*, § I, 6.
gr'hanah'ti *gr'hanah'ti* (acc. neut), § VIII, 10, (nom) § I, 3, II, 4, XI, 8, &c., and acc. plur. *gr'hanah'ti*, § VIII, 11.
gr'hanah'ti *gr'hanah'ti*, III, 1, 3, § VII, 12, *gr'hanah'ti* *gr'hanah'ti*, III, 2, 6, *gr'hanah'ti*, II, 1, 4, 2, 2, 4, 2, *gr'hanah'ti*, II, 1, 4, 2, 1, 2, 4, 2, *gr'hanah'ti*, II, 4, 2, *gr'hanah'ti*, II, 3, 6, III, 1, 3, 4, 2, 6, § VII, 8, 9, VIII, 11, *gr'hanah'ti*, III, 2, 6, § IX, 7, *gr'hanah'ti*, II, 3, 5, *gr'hanah'ti*, III, 2, 6, *gr'hanah'ti*, II, 3, 8, III, 2, 1, § VII, 8, 9, *gr'hanah'ti*, III, 1, 3, § VII, 9.

- mahamaghe*, III, 2, 4, *ak* or *ak* (I), § VII, 3, 2, § VIII, 7
mahāvratam, I, 1, 1, § I, 1, (instr) III, 2, 4; § VIII, 6, (gen) I, 2, 1, (loc) III, 2, 3, § VII, 4
mahāvratatvam, I, 1, 1
√ma sampramimite, II 3, 6, *maṣam*, II, 3, 6, *sampramitah*, I, 2, 4
maṣam, II, 1, 6, III, 2, 1, § VIII, 1
maṣa, III, 1, 6, § VII, 15
maṣa, III, 1, 8, § VII, 13, *maṣayam*, III, 1, 6, § VII, 18, *maṣam*, § XII, 8
maṣamātram, III, 1, 5, § VIII, 12
maṣam, III, 2, 5, § VIII, 9, (acc.) I, 3, 1, *maṣam* (gen), I, 3, 1
maṣa, II, 1, 8, III, 2, 5, *maṣa*, III 1, 4, *maṣa* (dat), II, 1, 4, III, 1, 1, *maṣam*, II, 1, 5, *maṣa*, II, 1, 8, II, 4, 3, *maṣa* (gen), I, 4, 8, I, 2, 2, II, 2, 3
maṣam, I 5, 3
maṣa, see *maṣa*²
maṣam, I, 2, 2, II, 2, 1, 3, *maṣam* (acc.), III, 1, 6, § VII, 18
maṣamam, I, 2, 4, &c., (acc) I, 2, 4 &c., (instr) I, 2, 4, (abl) II, 3, 6, *maṣamam*, I, 2, 4
maṣamākaroti, II 3, 6
maṣam, II, 2, 2, (acc) II, 4, 2, (abl) II 4, 2
maṣamāh, I, 2, 2
maṣamāh (sem), I, 3, 5
maṣamāh, I, 2, 4
√maṣa amureṣayā, II, 4, 1
maṣam, II, 4, 3
maṣam, II, 1, 8, 3, 6
maṣam, II, 1, 8, 4, 1, 2, *maṣam*, § XI, 8, *maṣamam*, § XIII
maṣa, II, 1, 5
maṣa, III, 2, 4
yaṣa, I, 1, 1, &c., *yaṣam*, I, 2, 3, &c., *yaṣa*, I, 2, 4, II, 2, 1, *yaṣa*, I, 1, 2, *yaṣa*, I, 2, 4, &c., *yaṣam*, II, 1, 5, *yaṣam*, I, 2, 4, *yaṣa*, I, 1, 4 &c., *yaṣam* (neut.), II, 3, 1, *yaṣam* (gen), II, 3, 6, *yaṣam* (masc), II, 1, 4, 3, 8, *yaṣam*, III 2, 5, *yaṣam* (neut.), II 9, 2
yaṣa, II 1, 1, *yaṣa*, I, 3, 5, II, 1, 1, *yaṣam*, I, 3, 4, II, 2, 4, *yaṣa* (acc.) I, 3, 5, *yaṣam* (masc.), I, 1, 3, &c., (indef rel) *yaṣa yaṣa* (acc.), I, 3, 2, and see *kaṣa*
√yaṣa yaṣa, III, 2, 6, § VIII, 11, *yaṣamam*, I, 1, 2, 2, 2, (acc) I, 1, 2, 5, 1, (dat) I, 1, 4
yaṣam, II, 3, 6, (instr) I, 3, 2, (abl) I, 3, 2
yaṣam, II, 3, 3, (acc) I, 1, 4, (gen) III, 2, 3, § VIII, 3, (loc) II, 3, 4, (gen plur) II, 3, 3, (loc plur) II, 2, 4
√yaṣa yaṣam, III, 1, 2, § VII, 3, cf *naṣam*
yaṣam, II 1, 8
yaṣamam, I, 1, 4
yaṣa, I, 3, 8, § VIII, 9, *yaṣa ha ka*, I, 3, 8, 5, 2, II, 1, 5, *yaṣa ha ka*, III, 2, 5, *ka - yaṣa*, I, 5, 2, *yaṣa - ka*, I, 3, 8
yaṣam - *etam*, I, 3, 1, *yaṣamamam*, II, 4, 2, *yaṣa* (no verb), II, 4, 1, III, 2, 4, § VIII, 7, *yaṣa - etam*, II, 1, 6, 3, 5, III, 1, 2, 1, 5, *yaṣa - kaṣa*, II, 1, 2, 3, *yaṣa ha kaṣa*, III 1, 3, 4, § VII, 8, 9, *yaṣa - etam*, I, 3, 1, § XI, 2, 2
yaṣamamamam, I, 4, 1
yaṣamamam, II, 3, 2
yaṣamamam, III, 1, 5
yaṣamamam, I, 5, 1
yaṣa (adv) - *kaṣa* (time), I, 2, 1, &c., (causal) I, 3, 1, &c., *yaṣa* (causal), II 1, 2, &c., (condit) II, 3, 6, &c., after *abhyāsa* *etam* (with *yaṣa*), III, 2, 3, 4, § VIII, 8, 9
yaṣa (time), III, 2, 4, § VIII, 7 (The temporal sense is really practically conditional)
yaṣa, I, 1, 2, &c., § VII, 10, &c.
√yam samprapachate, II, 1, 2, 3, 2, *udoyacham*, I, 2, 1
yaṣa, I, 4, 3, II, 3, 7, (dat) I, 4, 2, (instr) III, 2, 2, &c., § VII, 2, &c.
yaṣam, II, 3, 5
√ya yaṣa, III, 2, 4, *yaṣa*, I 1, 4
yaṣa - *etam* - *etam*, II, 1, 7, *yaṣa* (with *dyataprithu* nom da as II 2, 2) I 3, 8, *yaṣam*, I 5, 2
√ya yaṣam, II, 3, 8, *yaṣamamam*, I, 3, 5 (from Rgveda)
√yaṣa amam - yaṣam, II, 3, 8, *yaṣam* (nom), II, 3, 8, *yaṣam*, § I, 8, *yaṣa* (du) II, 3, 8, *yaṣam*, II, 3, 8, *yaṣam* (masc), III, 2, 4, *yaṣamam* (v I *yaṣamam*), § XI, 8
yaṣam (plur), II, 3, 8
√yaṣa abhyāyudhyat, I, 3, 4
yaṣa, I, 2, 4, &c., *yaṣam*, I, 4, 2, *yaṣa* (dub), ital

√*saks* *saktiyate*, III, 1, 6; √ II, 19
rajyatuḥ, I, 2, 3
ratharya, III, 2, 4; √ III, 7; XI, 3.
rathan *ibāsh*, III, 1, 4; √ III, 7
rathanīstaram, I, 4, 2, II, 3, 4; (gen) III, 1,
 6, √ II, 4, VII, 19, √ III, 8
ratnayaḥ, III, 2, 4, √ III, 7
raśah, II, 3, 2, III, 2, 3, √ III, 3, *raśam*,
 √ II, 1.

√*rāj* *rājati*, II, 3, 7
rājanam (*iḍma*), II, 3, 4, √ II, 1
rāśiḥ, II, 1, 8, *raśayoh*, III, 2, 2, √ VIII,
 2, *rāśiḥ*, II, 2, 4
rāśiśānta, III, 2, 4
rāśiśāntaḥ, I, 1, 1
raśimāḥ, I, 1, 1

√*ric* *ricyate*, II, 3, 6; *ricyāt*, II, 3, 6,
rikam, II, 3, 6, *atiriktam*, I, 9, 2

√*ris* *riyati*, III, 1, 3, √ II, 9, 10
 √*riś* *reḥi* *reḥaḥ*, III, 1, 6 (borrowed from
 a RV passage), √ II, 18

√*rue* *tiruruciceta* (v. l. *tiruruciceta*), III,
 2, 5

√*rudh* *avarudha*, I, 1, 2, 3, 3, 7, *avaru*
dhyat, I, 1, 2, 3, 4, 2, 4, 3, 7, *avaruna*
dhi, I, 4, 3

√*ruh* *adhiraḥati*, *adhiraḥanti*, *adhiraḥat*, I,
 2, 4, *anvadhiraḥataḥ*, I, 2, 4, *avaraḥet*, I, 2,
 4, *samadhiraḥanti*, I, 2, 4, *samarahanti*, √
 II, 9, 10

rupam, I, 2, 1, &c., √ VII, 10 &c., (instr)
 I, 2, 2, 4, II, 2, 3, 2, 7, √ II, 19, (abl)
 I, 2, 1

rupasam *rddham*, I, 1, 3, &c., **rddhyat*, I, 5, 2,
**rddham*, I, 5, 2

reḥaḥ, I, 1, 2, 4, 2, II, 1, 3; 3, 3, 7, 4, 1,
 2, 5, III, 1, 2, 2, 2, √ VII, 2, 2, 7.
 (acc) √ X, 7, (abl) II, 4, 1, (gen) II, 1, 2,
 √ III, 2, (loc) √ X, 1, &c.

reḥasam (V), see *devareḥasam*

√*lebh* *lebbhe*, II, 2, 4, *alubhamaṇṇaḥ*, √ XI, 1
lelatam, II, 1, 2

lehaḥ, I, 4, 2, 3, II, 1, 3, 6, 6, III, 1, 6, √
 VII, 14, (acc) I, 4, 3, II, 1, 2, 1, 1, 3,
 3, 7, 8, (instr) III, 1, 1, &c., √ VII, 2,
 &c., (abl) II, 3, 7, 6, (loc) I, 4, 3, II, 1,
 3, 8, 5, 6, √ XI, 4, (nom plur) I, 1, 2,
 2, 3, 4, II, 4, 1, 3, 5, (acc) II, 4, 1, √

I, 5; (gen) I, 1, 2; 2, 5, (loc) II, 3, 7,
 (nom du) I, 2, 3.

lohaḥ *ślāḥ*, III, 2, 3; (acc) II, 4, 1.

loḥ *ṣaḥ* (acc.), II, 3, 1

loṇḍ *it*, II, 1, 6, 4, 1; √ I, 4 (*reṇḍ*), √
 √ III, 11, (acc) II, 4, 2, (abl) I, 3, 8, II,
 4, 1

loṇḍama (paut), III, 2, 5; (*reṇḍama*) √
 √ III, 9

loḥitam, II, 3, 3; 7, III, 2, 1, √, √ III, 1.

loḥim, III, 2, 4, √ VIII, 7

ramah, III, 1, 4, 2, 1; √ II, 8, 9; √ III,
 1, (acc) III, 1, 4, √ II, 8, 9, (nom
 plur) III, 2, 1, √ III, 1

raṇḍa *ṣaḥ* *ślāḥ* (proper name), II, 1, 1

√*rac* *avacama*, III, 2, 2, 3, √ III, 2,
avacata, II, 2, 2, *avacam*, √ I, 6, *avaca*, II,
 2, 3, √ I, 6, *avac*, √ I, 6, *uḥam*, I, 3, 2, &c.

avirukṣat, I, 2, 2, √ II, 1, (acc) I, 2, 2,
avukṣe, III, 2, 4, √ III, 5, *avucanah*, I,
 2, 2, *adhyanukṣam*, √ VII, 15

raḥa, II, 2, 2, 4, 2

√*rad* *vadati*, II, 1, 5, 3, 2, 6, 8, √ II,
 2, *vadate*, √ I, 8, *vadanti*, I, 3, 2, II, 1, 2,
 3, 2, *adhivadate*, II, 1, 6, *vadim*, I, 3, 4,
 II, 3, 8, *avadam*, II, 1, 4, *vade* (?), √ XIII,
upavadet, III, 2, 3, 4, √ II, 8, 9, *uḥ* *ale*,
 I, 5, 2, *uḥante*, I, 3, 7, *uḥitam*, II, 1, 5,
uḥayel, III, 2, 5, *adhynukṣam*, √ VII, 15,
 &c. *vag vadati*, √ VIII, 9

vaṇḍayate, III, 2, 3

√*vap* *avapante*, I, 5, 2, *samapyaḥ*, II, 3, 1

vayam, II, 1, 4, 6, III, 1, 5, 2, 6, √ III,
 11, *vam* (acc.), II, 4, 2

vayam, I, 2, 4, 4, 2, (proper name) II, 1,
 1, *vayam*, I, 2, 4, 4, 2

vayam, II, 5

vayam (acc.), II, 2, 3, √ I, 6

vayam, III, 2, 4, (instr) III, 2, 4

vayam, II, 1, 7, (gen) II, 1, 7

vayam, II, 1, 7, (gen) II, 1, 7, (nom plur)
 I, 5, 2, II, 2, 1, (acc) II, 2, 1, √ XI, 8

vayam, I, 5, 2, II, 6, √ II, 11, (acc) I, 5, 1,
 √ II, 10, 11, (loc) I, 3, 4 (?), 5, 1, √ II, 11

vayam, I, 2, 4

√*vas* *avasa*, III, 2, 4, √ XI, 4

√*var* *avare*, II, 1, 6

√*vak* *avakṣat*, II, 1, 7, *pru* *avakṣat*, III, 2, 4,

śāhauṣa, II, 1, 6. *śāhauṣa* II, 3, 8,
śāhauṣaśāhauṣa, II, 3, 8. *śāhauṣa*, I, 1, 4
śā (=indeed), I, 2, 2, 4, 3, 8. II, 6. (=or)
 I, 4, 1, II, 1, 2, 8. III, 2, 6. § VIII,
 7, &c. *śā-śā*, III, 1, 6, § VII, 14
śā *śāhauṣa*, III, 2, 4
śāh, I, 1, 1, 4, 3, 2, 8, 4, 2, &c. § VII,
 2, &c. (acc.) I, 1, 1, 1, 3, 1, 8, II, 1, 6,
 III, 1, 6, 2, 6, § VIII, 8 &c. (instr.) I, 3,
 2, II, 1, 6, 7, 3, 5, 8. III, 1, 1, 6, 8
 VII, 1, &c. (gen.) I, 3, 1, &c. § VIII, 8,
 (loc.) II, 3, 5, III, 1, 6, 2, 6, § VII, 18,
 &c. (acc. plur.) III, 2, 5
śāhbrahmanam, III, 2, 6, *brahmanam*, § VIII,
 10
śāgrasāh, III, 2, 5
śāhauṣaśāh, III, 2, 1, 2, 3, § VIII, 1, 2, (acc.)
 III, 2, 1, 1, 3, § VIII, 1, 2
śāhauṣa, I, 2, 1
śādanam, III, 2, 5, § VIII, 9
śāhauṣa, II, 2, 1
śāhauṣa, I, 2, 3, II, 2, 1, 2, 7, 3, 1, 4, 1, III,
 2, 4, § VII, 3, &c. (acc.) § XI, 1, (gen.)
 II, 1, 7, III, 2, 5, (loc.) III, 2, 3, § VII, 4
śāhauṣa, I, 1, 3, &c.
śāhauṣaśāh, I, 2, 1
śāhauṣaśāh, I, 5, 2
śāhauṣa, I, 3, 4, 5, II, 2, 1, 4, 2
śāhauṣaśāh (*śāhauṣa*), III, 2, 1, § VIII, 1
śāhauṣa, II, 3, 6
śāhauṣaśāh, I, 5, 1
śāhauṣaśāh, I, 5, 1
śāhauṣaśāh, I, 4, 1 (nom. sing. or nom. plur. ?)
śāhauṣaśāh, II, 6, (gen.) III, 2, 5
śāhauṣaśāh, I, 1, 2, &c. § VII, 14 &c.
 (1st pers.) II, 1, 3, 8, *śāhauṣaśāh*, II, 3, 2, §
 VIII, 9, *śāhauṣaśāh*, I, 5, 2, II, 1, 5, III, 1, 4,
 § VII, 8, *śāhauṣaśāh*, I, 3, &c. § VIII, 12,
 &c. *śāhauṣaśāh* (gen.) I, 3, 4, § I, 8, (acc.
 pl.) § VII, 14, *śāhauṣaśāh*, § VIII, 12.
śāhauṣaśāh, III, 1, 6, *śāhauṣaśāh*, III, 1, 1,
 § VII, 2
śāh, I, 3, 8
śāh *śāhauṣaśāh*, II, 3, 8, *śāhauṣaśāh*, I, 3, 5
śāhauṣaśāh, III, 1, 2, § VII, 3, (acc.) III, 2, 4, §
 VIII, 7, (nom. pl.) § XI, 2, (acc.) § XI, 1
śāhauṣaśāh, II, 3, 3, 4. *śāhauṣaśāh* (v. 1. *śāhauṣaśāh*)
 II, 3, 1, *śāhauṣaśāh*, II, 3, 3, 4

abhiśam, viðhiśayah, II, 1, 7
virat I, 1, 2, 3, 4, 4, 1, (acc.) I, 1, 2,
 (loc.) I, 3, 4, (instr. du.) I, 4, 2, (nom.
 plur.) I, 4, 1, 5, 2, (acc.) I, 5, 2
varataturitānu, I, 3, 4
√vat samvatsare, II, 1, 6, *abhinivatsare*, I, 2, 4,
pravatsare, II, 1, 4, 4, 2, *prativatsare*, II, 4, 2,
pravatsare, II, 4, 2, *prativatsare*, II, 1, 4, 2,
vat, I, 3, 8, *avatsare*, II, 1, 1, *niśamsare* (acc.
 mase.), II, 1, 5, *vatsare* (fem.) I, 3, 8, *niśam-*
sare (fem.), II, 1, 1, *avatsare*, Ś XI, 1, *av-*
vatsare (acc.), Ś XI, 2, *prativatsare*, Ś XI, 1,
vatsare, I, 1, 1
vatsare, I, 2, 2 (in an etymology), II, 2, 1,
vatsare (acc.), I, 4, 4, III, 1, 6, Ś VII, 14,
vatsare (acc.) III, 1, 6, Ś VII, 14, *vatsare*
abhiśam, Ś VII, 13
vasuś (acc.), II, 1, 6 (from Rgveda)
vastapam, II, 1, 2
vastu, II, 3, 7
√va *avayam*, II, 4, 3 (Monier Williams' *Dict.*
 but not Whitney, *Roots*, &c., and *√va* is
 much more probable)
vina, *vinase* *vinase* (acc.), III, 1, 3, Ś VII,
 9 *vinase* (gen.), Ś VII, 10
vivatsare, I, 2, 1
viryam, I, 1, 3, 1, 2, 4, 2, (acc.) I, 5, 1, 2,
 (loc.) I, 2, 2, (nom. plur.) I, 4, 2
viryasare, I, 1, 3 *viryasare* I, 5, 7
viryasare *vinase* I, 2, 4
√va *parivatsare* II, 1, 5, *parivatsare*, II, 3, 6,
 III, 2, 5, *avatsare* (nom.) II, 1, 6
vrksh, II, 3, 6, Ś XI, 1, 2, (acc.) I, 2, 4
√vri *avatsare*, II, 3, 6, *avatsare* (acc.),
 Ś VII, 10, II, 1, 3, 5 *avatsare*, I, 3,
 1, *avatsare*, II, 1, 6
Vratam, I, 1, 1
vrtha II, 3, 6
√vri *varuṣe* III, 1, 2, Ś VII, 3
vr̥ṣ I, 2, 4, 3
vr̥ṣant I, 2, 1
vr̥ṣ, III, 1, 2, Ś VII, 2, *vr̥ṣant* *varuṣe*
 (varuṣe B), Ś VII, 3
vr̥ṣ (acc.), I, 2, 4, better read *vr̥ṣ*
vr̥ṣ, I, 3, 2, II, 2, 2, III, 1, 6, 2, 4, Ś VII,
 18, (acc.) III, 2, 3, Ś VII, 3, (gen. plur.)
 Ś II, 1
vr̥ṣant, III, 2, 3, Ś VII, 3
vr̥ṣ, I, 1, 1, &c., Ś VII, 3, &c.

sat idam, I, 5, 3
 √yag yagac, I, 2, 2
 yajñānanti, II, 2, 4, § VIII, 11
 yajñah, II, 3, 3; § VIII, 8, X, 8, &c
 yajñatīk, I, 3, 1
 yajñatīk, II, 2, 2, (nom plur) I, 3, 2, (acc.)
 I, 3, 2, § I, 6
 √yraj yrajyati, III, 2, 4, § XI, 4
 √yama yamati, I, 2, 3, &c, § II, 1, &c, V
 VIII, 5, &c, anulamati, I, 5, 2, parivam
 sati (with acc and instr), I, 4, 2, yamati,
 III, 2, 4, yama, II, 2, 3, yamāyanti, II,
 2, 3, yate, § I, 5, last-o, I, 5, 1, yajñata,
 II, 2, 3, anulasyanti, II, 3, 4, yamam, § I, 1
 √yab yabmati, III, 1, 4, § VI 8, &c, alakmat,
 II, 4, 3, yabnam, yabnamantam III 1, 4,
 § VII, 8, 9, alakmat, III, 1, 4, § VII, 8,
 alakmatam, § VII, 8, alakmatantam, § VII, 9
 yatam I, 2, 2, 4, 2, II, 2, 1, 3, 4 (acc.) II,
 2, 1, § XI, 8, yatam (shakata), II, 3, 6,
 (yatsu), III, 2, 1, § VIII, 2
 yataranah, II, 2, 1
 yataranantataryaya, II, 2, 4, § II, 17
 yathah, II, 1, 4
 yathavata, III, 2, 5, § VIII, 9
 yavram, II, 1, 4, 2, 4, III, 2, 1, (acc.) II,
 1, 4, (abl.) II, 1, 4, § XI, 1, (gen.) II, 1,
 4, (loc.) § XI, 1, (nom plur) II, 1, 8,
 (acc.) II, 1, 8, (instr) II, 3, 5
 yavratam (acc.) II, 1, 4
 yavratavratat, III, 2, 3, § VIII, 3
 yavratadhat, II, 5, 6
 yavraya (gen.), I, 3, 4, yavrayam, I, 3, 4
 yavat, III, 1, 6
 yavramam, I, 2, 1, yavramam, § I, 6
 yavrah, I, 1, 3, &c, yavraya (dat.) I, 1, 3, &c,
 § I, 4, &c, yavraya (or yavrah), I, 1, 3, &c
 yavramam, III, 2, 1, § VIII, 1
 yavrah, I, 4, 1, II, 3, 4, III, 2, 5, § VIII, 9,
 (gen.) II, 1, 4, § II, 2, (loc.) III, 1, 2, §
 VII, 3
 yavratam, II, 1, 4, (acc.) II, 1, 4
 yamam, II, 4, 1, (acc.) II, 4, 2, (instr) II, 4,
 1, (abl.) I, 3, 3, II, 4, 1
 yavrayat, II, 1, 4, yavrayah, II, 5, adhivarte,
 § II, 4
 yavram, I, 2, 2, II, 2, 4
 yavrayah, I, 5, 1

yavrah, I, 2, 4
 yavram, II, 1, 5
 yavrah (acc. du.), III, 1, 3, § VII, 10
 √yas yasyati, II, 3, 6
 √yā atari, II, 1, 4, yavrat, II, 1, 4, aliyata,
 II, 1, 4
 √yā yavrayat, III, 2, 4, § XI, 4, yata,
 § II, 11
 yavramam, II, 1, 7
 √yā yavrayati, I, 2, 2, aliyata, II, 1, 4,
 yavrah, I, 3, 2, (sem.) II, 1, 4
 yavrah, I, 1, 3, 2, 4, yavram, I, 2, 4, yavraya (dat.),
 I, 4, 2, yavrah (nom.), II, 1, 4
 yavram, I, 1, 3
 √yā yavrayati, II, 1, 7, yavrah, II, 6, yav
 ramam, II, 1, 7, aliyata, II, 1, 4, yavrayat,
 III, 2, 4, § VIII, 7, yavrayat, III, 2, 4
 (yavrayat, § VIII, 7), aliyat, III, 2, 4, §
 VIII, 7, yavrayat, § VIII, 9, yavram (nom.),
 II, 4, 3, yavrah, II, 3, 8, yavraya, II, 4, 3
 yavrayatavrah, III, 2, 5, § VIII, 9
 yavram, I, 3, 3
 yavrayatam, I, 1, 5
 yavrah, III, 2, 4, § VIII, 7
 yavram, I, 3, 8, II, 1, 4, 4, 1, 2, § VII, 4
 &c, (acc.) II, 1, 7, § VI, 6, (instr) II, 1,
 2, 4, 3, (abl.) II, 4, 2, (gen.) II, 1, 7, III,
 2, 5, (loc.) § XI, 2, (nom du.) II, 3, 8
 yavrayatavrah, III, 2, 1, 2, 3, § VIII, 1, 2,
 (acc.) III, 2, 1, 2, 3, § VIII, 1, 2
 yavram, II, 3, 3, yavram, § II, 1
 yavrah, II, 3, 8
 √yā yavrayati, II, 1, 8
 yavramam (acc. neut.), II, 3, 2
 yat I, 3, 8, 4, 2, III, 2, 4
 yavrayatam yavrayam, II, 2, 4, 3, 8, yav
 rayatavrah, § II, 17
 yavrayat, I, 5, 2
 yavram, I, 3, 8
 yavrayatam (instr), III, 2, 1, § VIII, 1,
 2, 1, 3, &c, ya, I, 2, 2, &c
 yavrayat, II, 1, 5
 yavrayatavrah, III, 2, 6, § I, 1, V, 5, (acc.)
 III, 1, 6, § XI, 5, (adv.) I, 1, 1, (gen.) III,
 2, 1, § VIII, 1, XI, 3, (instr) § XI, 5,
 (nom plur) § VII, 10
 yavrayatavrayatavrah, III, 2, 3, § VIII, 1,
 (acc.) III, 2, 3, § VIII, 1

- samśada*, III, 2, 5.
samśrīṣ, I, 3, 7
samśrīṣ, III, 1, 1, &c., § VII, 2, &c., (acc)
 III, 2, 3, 6, *samśrīṣ* (gen), III, 1, 1,
 2, 6, § VII, 2, *samśrīṣ* (acc), III, 2, 6,
 § VIII, 11
samśrī, I, 2, 2
samśrīṣ, II, 6
samśrīṣ, II, 3, 8
samśrīṣ *ananta*, I, 5, 2, *ananta*, *ananta*
sakla, I, 5, 2
samśrīṣ, I, 5, 2, § II, 16
samśrīṣ, I, 2, 2
samśrīṣ, I, 2, 2, II, 6
samśrīṣ, III, 2, 6, § VIII, 11.
samśrīṣ, II, 1, 5, (gen) II, 1, 5
samśrīṣ, II, 1, 5
samśrīṣ, I, 2, 2, II, 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, § VII, 17,
 (acc) II, 3, 6, (gen) II, 3, 8, *samśrīṣ*, I,
 2, 2
samśrīṣ, § VII, 17
samśrīṣ, II, 3, 6, (acc) II, 3, 6
samśrīṣ *upaniṣada*, II, 2, 3
samśrīṣ, I, 3, 4
samśrīṣ (acc), II, 1, 6 (from Rgveda)
samśrīṣ, II, 6
samśrīṣ, I, 2, 2 (= Aitareya Brahmana, V, 16, 14)
samśrīṣ, III, 1, 2, § VIII, 3
samśrīṣ, III, 1, 6, § VII, 17
samśrīṣ, III, 1, 2, § VII, 2, &c., (acc) III,
 1, 3, 5, (nom plur) III, 2, 2, (acc) III, 2,
 2, (gen) III, 1, 2, § VIII, 1, 2
samśrīṣ, III, 1, 5, § VII, 13
samśrīṣ, I, 5, 1, 2, III, 2, 4, with *samśrīṣ*,
 III, 2, 1, § II, 10, VIII, 2, *samśrīṣ*,
 II, 3, 4
samśrīṣ, I, 2, 2
samśrīṣ, I, 5, 1.
samśrīṣ, III, 2, 6
samśrīṣ, I, 2, 4
samśrīṣ (nom neut), I, 1, 2, (instr) I, 1, 2
samśrīṣ (a prana), II, 3, 3.
samśrīṣ *samśrīṣ* (masc.), II, 3, 1, *samśrīṣ*
nam, II, 1, 2, III, 1, 1, *samśrīṣ* (dia.), III,
 1, 1
samśrīṣ, I, 5, 2
samśrīṣ, I, 5, 3.
samśrīṣ, II, 3, 3.
samśrīṣ, I, 1, 2, (instr) I, 3, 8
- samśrīṣ*, II, 3, 2, 3
samśrīṣ, I, 4, 2
samśrīṣ, III, 1, 2, § VIII, 2
samśrīṣ, II, 3, 1; 6
samśrīṣ, II, 3, 2
samśrīṣ, II, 1, 8
samśrīṣ, III, 2, 1, § VIII, 1, 2
samśrīṣ, I, 3, 5, &c., § VIII, 1, &c., *samśrīṣ*,
 II, 3, 6, § VII, 22, *samśrīṣ*, I, 1, 5, &c.;
 § VII, 3, *samśrīṣ* (acc. neut), I, 3, 5, II,
 2, 1, &c., § VII, 2, &c.; *samśrīṣ* (gen),
 III, 2, 5, *samśrīṣ*, I, 1, 3, &c., § VIII, 1, &c.,
samśrīṣ, II, 2, 2; *samśrīṣ*, I, 3, 4, II, 1, 2,
 6, *samśrīṣ*, I, 1, 3, &c., *samśrīṣ*, II, 2, 3,
samśrīṣ, II, 2, 2, *samśrīṣ* (neut.), I, 3, 4,
samśrīṣ (dat neut), II, 1, 3, 8, 2, 2,
 (abl neut) II, 5, *samśrīṣ* (masc.), I, 1, 3,
 II, 2, 1, 2, (prof neut) III, 2, 4, § VIII, 7,
samśrīṣ (neut), III, 2, 3, § VII, 22, *samśrīṣ*,
 § X, 1
samśrīṣ, II, 3, 5, § VII, 3
samśrīṣ, II, 3, 8
samśrīṣ, III, 1, 2
samśrīṣ, I, 2, 4
samśrīṣ, III, 1, 2, 2, § VIII, 1, 2
samśrīṣ, II, 2, 2, (abl) II, 2, 3, (gen) I,
 2, 1
samśrīṣ (gen), I, 2, 3
samśrīṣ, III, 2, 6, § VIII, 11
samśrīṣ, II, 3, 4, (nom pler) II, 2, 4, 3, 8
samśrīṣ, I, 3, 8
samśrīṣ, I, 2, 2
samśrīṣ, III, 1, 5, 3, 6, § II, 1, VII, 13, (acc.)
 III, 1, 5, § VII, 13, (instr) I, 3, 2, § II,
 1, (abl) I, 3, 2, *samśrīṣ*, I, 4
samśrīṣ, II, 3, 4
samśrīṣ, II, 1, 5
samśrīṣ (acc), III, 2, 2, 2
samśrīṣ, I, 5, 2
samśrīṣ, II, 1, 6
samśrīṣ *samśrīṣ*, II, 5, *samśrīṣ*, I, 4, 2, *samśrīṣ*, I,
 1, 2, III, 2, 2, *samśrīṣ*, III, 2, 2, (*samśrīṣ*?)
 § VIII, 2
samśrīṣ, II, 4, 3
samśrīṣ *samśrīṣ*, I, 1, 4
samśrīṣ, II, 4, 2, (gen) III, 2, 4
samśrīṣ, I, 4, 2
samśrīṣ, I, 4, 2
samśrīṣ, I, 2, 2, II, 2, 2, (acc) II, 2, 2,

(instr.) I, 2, 2; (gen.) I, 5, 3; (nom. du.) I, 5, 2; (gen. plur.) I, 3, 8
 sadadokāḥ, I, 4, 1, &c.; Ś II, 1, (instr.) I, 4, 2; (acc.) Ś II, 1.
 √sr upasrtaḥ, III, 1, 6 (upasrtaḥ, Ś VII, 14).
 √svr samsvapate, I, 3, 4; utsvapate, I, 5, 1; asvapa, II, 4, 1, upasvapa, Ś XI, 1; upa-
 (sv)svape, Ś XI, 1; svapai, II, 4, 1; 3; Ś XI, 1, svataḥ, II, 1, 2, svasthāna (nom.), II, 4, 3; svataḥ, II, 1, 2, svataḥ (nom.), II, 1, 2; (fem.) II, 4, 2, upasvataḥ (fem.), Ś XI, 1; svatama, II, 4, 3, svasthā, III, 2, 6; svastya, II, 4, 3, prastyaṇṇate, I, 3, 5.
 √svr uśāsvapate, II, 1, 4, svastyaṇṇate, I, 3, 5, samutsvapate, I, 2, 4
 tonāḥ, II, 3, 3
 √skand askandīyate, III, 2, 4 (not in Ś VIII, 7)
 √stan stanayate, I, 2, 1.
 stanayan, I, 5, 1
 √stabh stabhāṅganam (acc.), I, 4, 1, tistabhāḥ, utstabhāṁ, II, 1, 6
 √stu prastanāte, II, 3, 4, stuvā, III, 2, 4 (stuvate, Ś VIII, 6), stuvāṇam, stuvate, Ś I, 4
 stabhāṅganam, II, 3, 8
 stomaḥ, I, 4, 1, (gen. plur.) I, 4, 2, 3, 1.
 stomachāṅgāṁśoḥ (gen.), I, 4, 1
 stomataḥ, II, 3, 4
 stomachāṅganam (dot.), I, 4, 1
 striyam, II, 3, 8, Ś XI, 4, striyam, II, 3, 7, 8, striyai (gen.), I, 4, 2, II, 5
 sthātyaḥ, I, 5, 1
 √stha sthātyate, II, 1, 1, 3, 1, prasthātyate, I, 1, 1, &c., a sthātyate, II, 1, 8, prasthātyate, I, 1, 1, &c., a sthātyate, I, 5, 2; utstātyate, II, 1, 4; utstātyate, II, 1, 4, sthātyam (nom.), I, 1, 1, prasthātyaḥ, I, 2, 2; prasthātyate, I, 3, 4; prasthātyam, I, 2, 2, 6, prasthātyaḥ, II, 4, 2, Ś X, 1, prasthātya, I, 4, 2; prasthātyaṇṇate, I, 2, 2, tistātye, Ś XI, 1, 2; tistātye, Ś XI, 1, 2
 sthānābhyaṁ (abl.), III, 1, 3, Ś II, 10
 sthāpakaḥ, III, 2, 4; Ś XI, 6
 sthāpakaḥ, II, 6; (gen.) Ś XI, 5; (loc.) Ś XI, 5
 sthāpate, II, 1, 6
 sthāpate, III, 2, 5, Ś VIII, 8

stharīśvapaḥ, III, 2, 1; Ś VIII, 1
 stharīśvapaḥ, II, 3, 6
 √sthrī upasthrīte, I, 2, 4; sthrī, II, 1, 6; sthrīam (nom.), II, 4, 3; sthrī, II, 4, 3
 sma, I, 1, 1, &c., in the form u ha sma, or ha sma, II, 1, 3, &c.; atha ha sma, Ś VII, 2 (see sma, A III, 1, 1)
 stvāḥ, II, 6
 √stvam tv asvamsaḥ, III, 2, 6; Ś VIII, 11.
 stvam, II, 5; stvā (masc.), III, 2, 6; Ś VII, 14, (neut.) Ś II, 1.
 √stad stādīyate, II, 1, 7
 √stad stādīyate, III, 1, 6, Ś VII, 18, stādīyate, II, 1, 8
 stādīyate, II, 4, 3; III, 2, 4; Ś XI, 4
 stādīyate, III, 2, 4.
 stādī, I, 2, 1.
 stādī, II, 3, 6; stādī, III, 2, 5; Ś VIII, 8, 9, stādī, II, 2, 4
 stvāṇam, III, 2, 1; Ś VIII, 1.
 stvāṇam, III, 1, 5; (stvāṇam stvāṇam), Ś VII, 10
 stvāṇam, III, 1, 6, (acc.) II, 3, 8, (instr.) III, 1, 1, Ś VIII, 2, &c.; (nom. plur.) I, 2, 4; (loc.) II, 5, 6 (always with lāḥ).
 stvāṇam, III, 1, 3, Ś I, 10.
 stvāṇam, I, 5, 2; 3
 stvāṇam, I, 5, 2; 3, (acc.) I, 5, 2; 3; Ś I, 4
 stvāṇam, I, 3, 4, (acc.) II, 6.
 √stad stādī, I, 3, 5
 ha, I, 1, 1, &c.; Ś VII, 2, &c.
 √ham hante, III, 2, 4; ahamante, I, 1, 2; ahamante, I, 2, 2, 3, 4, hantate, II, 3, 6; hantate, I, 1, 2; ahamante, II, 3, 8, ahamante gāṇam, II, 4, 3
 hante (with vady), II, 1, 4, Ś XI, 1.
 hante (acc.) I, 1, 4
 hante, II, 4, 2
 hante, II, 6; (gen. vady) Ś VIII, 8
 hante, I, 1, 2
 √hā hantate, III, 1, 4, Ś VIII, 8, 9, tistate III, 2, 4 (stvadīyate, Ś VIII, 7), tistate III, 2, 5, &c.
 ha, I, 1, 2, &c.
 √hame hantate, II, 5, ahamante, II, 1, 4
 hantate, I, 1, 2, (instr.) I, 3, 1.
 hantate, I, 3, 1.

āṣṭamaṣyaḥ II, 1, 3.

√*ku* *jukhamaḥ*, III, 2, 6, § VIII, 11, *kuṭva*, III, 2, 4, *jukhoti* § XI, 4, *kuṭam*, § X, 1, *jukhvat*, § XII, 8

√*ku* *kūjate*, II, 2, 4

√*kr* *mākarati*, I, 3, 5, 7, 8, *vjakarati*, I, 3, 3, III, 1, 1, *akṣipyaḥaranti*, III, 1, 3, § VII, 10, *upodīharanti*, III, 2, 6, (*udā*) § VIII, 10, *pratīharati*, II, 3, 4, *vj iharat*, I, 5, 3, *abhiṣy iharat*, III, 1, 6, § VII, 14,

haranti*, II, 1, 5, *ākarata*, II, 1, 7, *abhiṣya haranti* (?), III, 1, 6 (haran*, § VII, 14), *parivṛtāt*, III, 1, 1, § VII, 2, *anvartar* *tāt*, III, 1, 1 (*parāḥṛitā*, § VII 2) *abhiṣya*

kritya, II, 2, 3, 4, 3, *anvartarīya* II, 4, 1

krdayam, II, 1, 3, 4, 1, 6, § VII, 3 &c, (acc)

II, 4, 2, (abl) II, 4, 1, (gen) II, 1, 3

hata, I, 1, 3, &c.

dotrakāḥ, I, 2, 4

hrasvyaḥ, I, 5, 1

WORDS IN ŚĀNKHĀYANA ARANYAKA VII AND VIII WHICH ARE NOT FOUND IN THE PARALLEL PASSAGES IN ĀITAREYA ĀRANYAKA III

akṣatena (masc), VIII, 10

akṣipyaṣṭamaṣyaḥ, VIII, 4

anvartarīyagrāhah, VIII, 9

aprasaktre VIII 11

ābrahmācarane, VIII, 11

abhiṣyaḥ VIII, 5

abhiṣyaḥaravīḥam, VII, 14

abhiṣya VIII, 7

ābrahmācarah VII, 10

anvartarīya VIII 11

atāṣṭapīṣṭam, VIII, 11

ātāṣṭa VIII, 9

upasthānamāni, VIII, 9

rtvujam, VIII, 3

āṣṭa, VII, 10

āṣṭamaṣya, VII, 12 (vis ? *āṣṭamaṣya* in first case)

āṣṭamaṣya, VII, 12 (has ? *āṣṭamaṣya* in first case)

kṛtāḥ VIII, 20

krīṣṭaḥ, VII, 2

krīṣṭ, VIII, 11

kṛmāḥ, VIII, 20

gṛh VIII, 20

gṛhīṣṭāṣṭamaṣyaḥ, VIII, 20, **ab*, *thail*.

ṭatāḥ, VIII, 10.

āṣṭamaṣya, VIII, 9

āṣṭamaṣya, VIII, 1

āṣṭamaṣyaḥ, VII, 10

ṭatāḥ, VII, 20

ṭatāḥ, VII, 20, and see *gṛh*?

ṭatāḥ, VII, 14

ṭatāḥ, VIII 9

ṭatāḥ (?), VIII, 11

ṭatāḥ, VII, 10

ṭatāḥ, VII, 20

ṭatāḥ, VIII, 20

ṭatāḥ (completions) VIII, 21

ṭatāḥ, VIII 9

ṭatāḥ (completions) VIII, 21

ṭatāḥ, VIII 9

ṭatāḥ (completions) VIII, 21

ṭatāḥ, VIII 9

ṭatāḥ (completions) VIII, 21

√*ṭatāḥ* *ṭatāḥ* VIII, 10

ṭatāḥ, VIII, 10.

ṭatāḥ, VIII 20

ṭatāḥ, VII, 18

ṭatāḥ, VIII, 10

ṭatāḥ VIII, 11

ṭatāḥ, VIII, 7

ṭatāḥ, VIII, 17

ṭatāḥ, VIII 1 &c

ṭatāḥ, VIII, 21.

ṭatāḥ, VIII, 20

ṭatāḥ, VIII, 2

ṭatāḥ, VIII, 20, and see *gṛh*?

WORDS IN ŚĀṆKHAIAṆA ARANYAKA IN \ VI XII 8 AND XIII WHICH ARE NOT FOUND IN AITAREYA ARANYAKA I-III (ARANYAKA IV IS MAINLY A REPETITION OF CHĀNDOGYA UPANISAD)

angīrṣaḥ \ 8 (acc.) \ 8.
 aśaś udāśat \ I 1 aśaś \ I 4 \ II 8
 cf. IV 8

adhyatmānam \ 1
 anekakaryāṇa ānāt \ 1
 gṛāman (nom. neut. not in Bṛhadāraṇyaka)
 XII

amrīṣamāḥ \ II 5 19 \ I 1
 aya \ I 7
 amrīṣatāḥ \ 4 (nom.) \ 6 (acc.) \ 6
 (last) \ 6
 aśaś gṛāṇa \ 8
 ātma \ I 7

jyāvat am (acc.) \ I 4
 ījāṇaś \ 4 (acc.) \ I 4
 ā nāṇa am \ I
 an āram \ I
 anīṣaś \ I 1
 aśaś a nāt \ XII 8
 ī nāt \ I 1 (acc.) \ I 1

aśaś am (acc.) \ I 8
 an āram (acc.) \ II 8
 aśaś aśaś (wiśaśaś) \ II 8
 ījāṇaś (?) \ XII 8 aśaś
 aśaś gṛāṇaś \ I 4

gṛāṇaśaś gṛāṇaś m (?) \ XII 8
 ekām ekāśaś \ II 8
 anāṇaśaś m \ XII 8

ānāt \ II 8
 ā nāṇa \ I 8
 ā m \ I 4
 ānātāśaś acc. am \ 6
 ā nāṇaśaś \ I 4
 ā nāṇaśaś ānātāśaś \ I 4
 ā nāṇaśaś (?) (aśaś dat.) \ I 1
 ānāt aśaś am \ II 4

gṛāṇaśaś \ I 8
 ā nāṇa (acc.) \ I 4

gṛāṇaśaś \ II 8

anāṇaśaś \ II 8
 anāṇaśaś \ I 8
 anāṇaśaś \ II 8

jyāvat (acc.) \ I 4 \ II 8 cf. IV 8
 ījāṇaś \ I 8

ījāṇaś \ II 8
 ījāṇaś \ I 7
 ā nāṇaśaśaś \ I 4
 ānātāśaś (adv.) \ II 8

ā nāṇaśaś (acc. neut.) \ I 4 \ II 8
 ā nāṇaśaś \ 8 ānāt \ II 8
 ānātāśaś \ 8

ānātāśaś ānātāśaś \ I 4 \ II 8
 ānātāśaś \ 8

anāṇaśaś ānātāśaś \ 1
 ānātāśaś \ 1
 ānātāśaś ānātāśaś \ I 5 6 1 8

ā nāṇaśaś \ I 8
 ā nāṇaśaś \ 8 (acc.) \ I 4
 ānātāśaś ānātāśaś \ I 1
 ā nāṇaśaśaśaś \ I 4
 ā nāṇaśaś \ 1
 ā nāṇaśaś \ I 1
 ānātāśaś ānātāśaś \ II 8
 ānātāśaś \ II 8

ānātāśaś ānātāśaś \ II 8
 ā nāṇaśaś \ I 7
 ānātāśaś \ II 8
 ānātāśaś ānātāśaś \ III 1

ānātāśaś \ I 8
 ānātāśaś \ II 8

anātāśaś \ II 8
 ānātāśaś ānātāśaś \ II 8
 ānātāśaś \ I 8 (loc.) \ I 1
 ānātāśaś ānātāśaś \ I 1 \ II 8
 ānātāśaś ānātāśaś \ II 8

INDEX VI

WORDS OCCURRING IN ĀRANYAKA V, AND IN THE PARALLEL PASSAGES OF ŚĀNKHĀYANA ĀRANYAKA I AND II, OTHER THAN THOSE OCCURRING IN QUOTATIONS.

(When the case or gender is ambiguous, it is nom. or masc. unless otherwise specified. The words noted as occurring in quotations might also be classed in Index IV, but are of a slightly different type.)

- Agmāh*, 1, 1, (acc.) 1, 2, (gen.) 1, 1
agnipucham, 1, 2
agnisamāṣṭh, 3, 2, Ś II, 2B
agrena, 1, 2
ahām, 3, 2
aj, *ajitā*, 3, 3, *abhyajya*, 3, 3
ajayād, 1, 4
ajāh, 1, 1
ajigrahyaṇ, 3, 1
ajra, 1, 1, 2, 6
ajha, 1, 4, &c., *ajha ha*, 2, 4
ajhataḥ, 3, 3
ajhataḥ, 3, 1, (loc.) 1, 5
ajhāt, 3, 3
abhyajyena, 3, 3
abhyajyaḥ, 3, 1, (acc.) 3, 2, (nom. plur.) 1, 5
ajam *ayajama*, 3, 2, *abhyajya*, Ś I, 6,
abhyajamāṇi, Ś I, 6
anagmā, 3, 2
anagmāṇi, 3, 2
anaparyāṇi, 1, 1
anāḥṇāṇi, 3, 3
anāḥṇāṇi, 3, 3
anāḥṇāṇi, 1, 4
anāḥṇāṇi, 1, 1, 3, 2
anāḥṇāṇi, 3, 2 cf. *anāḥṇāṇi*, Ś II, 17
anāḥṇāṇi, 3, 1
anāḥṇāṇi, 1, 3
anāḥṇāṇi (in quot.), 1, 1
anāḥṇāṇi, 2, 5, (acc.) 1, 5
anjana, 3, 3, *anjana*, 3, 2, 3, (acc.) 3, 3
anjanaḥ (nom.), 3, 3, *anjanaḥ* (dat. masc.), 1, 4, *anjana*, 1, 6, 2, 1
anjana, 1, 2
anjanaḥ, 3, 3
anjana, 3, 3
aj, 1, 4, 6, 3, 3, *anjana*, 1, 4
anjanaḥ (acc.), 1, 3
anjanaḥ (with acc.), 1, 3
anjanaḥ (acc.), 1, 4
anjana (acc.), 1, 4
anjana, 1, 4
anjanaḥ, 1, 5
anjanaḥ, 1, 5
anjanaḥ, 3, 1, (instr.) 3, 1, (abl.) 3, 1,
 (acc. plur.) 3, 1
anjanaḥ, 2, 1, *anjanaḥ* (fem.), 2, 5
 (reading doubtful)
anjana, 3, 3
anjanaḥ (acc.), 3, 2
anjanaḥ (acc. or perhaps nom.) 1, 1
anjanaḥ, 1, 4 (v. 1 *anjanaḥ*)
anjanaḥ, 1, 6
anjanaḥ (acc. nom. 7), 3, 3
anjanaḥ, 2, 5, 1, 1, 1, 1
anjana, 2, 6
anjana, 2, 2
anjanaḥ, 2, 2
anjanaḥ, 1, 3
anjanaḥ, 1, 3
anjanaḥ, 1, 3
anjanaḥ, 1, 3

enam, 1, 4.

etā, 1, 3; 4; 3, 2

etāna, 1, 4; 5; 3, 3

etā, 1, 3; etāś, 1, 3; 2, 2; 3, 1; etam, 2, 4; 3, 2, 3, etāna, 1, 6; 2, 3; etād, 3, 2; 3; etāyā, 1, 6; etāya (acc.), 2, 4; 3, 1; 2, 3. etāmi (nom.), 1, 3; ete (acc. nom.), 1, 6; etāś (gen. nom.), 1, 6, etāś (nom. fem.), 2, 8, etāna, 1, 6, etāna (acc.) 1, 6; etāś, 1, 1

etāhikāna, 3, 3.

etāhikāna, 3, 1.

etāhikāna (acc. nom.), 1, 4, (instr.) 1, 1;

etāhikāna, 1, 3.

etāhikāna, etāhikāna, 1, 4

etāhikā, 1, 4, § 11, 7

etāma, etā (yadā), 1, 4

etāma, 3, 3

etāma, 3, 3

etāma, 1, 3

etāma (acc.), 1, 5

etāma (nom.), 1, 3

etāma (nom.), 1, 4

etāma, 1, 3

etāma, 1, 3 (prob. etāma)

etāma, 1, 3

etāma, 1, 4

etāma, 1, 2, etāma, 1, 4; etāma (loc.),

1, 2, etāma, 3, 3; etāma, 1, 6, 3, 1, etāma-

ya, 1, 3, etāma, 3, 3

etāma, 1, 2, etāma, 1, 2, etāma, 1, 4,

etāma, 1, 3, etāma, 1, 1, 2.

etāma, 1, 3.

etāma, 1, 3.

etāma, 1, 6

etāma, 1, 6, etāma, 1, 6, etāma, 1, 6,

3, 2.

etāma, 3, 3.

etāma, 1, 3, etāma, 1, 4, § 11, 11

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 3; § 13, 7, etāma, 1, 4.

etāma, 1, 1.

etāma, 1, 2.

etāma, 1, 4; etāma, 1, 4

etāma, 1, 6.

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1; 3; 3; 4; 5; 6; 3, 1; etāma, 1, 1;

etāma, 3, 3; etāma, 1, 4; 4

etāma, 1, 1; (acc.) 1, 1; 3, 1.

etāma, 1, 3

etāma, 1, 4; etāma, 1, 4.

11, 6.

etāma, 1, 1.

etāma, 1, 1.

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

etāma, 1, 1

- travaiyam*, 3, 3
trividyagatnam, 3, 1
trish, 1, 3, 4, 6
travidham, 1, 2
dukunah, 2, 2; (acc. masc.) 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 7.
 (acc. neut.) 1, 4, (instr. fem.) 1, 5 (loc.) 1, 1,
 (acc. plur. masc. in quot.) 1, 1, (instr. in quot.)
 1, 1
dukunadah, 1, 2, 3
dukunottare (acc.), 1, 3, cf. *dukunottarinam*
upetihayi krt-d, § 1, 7
duha, 1, 1, *duhobhik*, 1, 4
dutah, 3, 1
duhatinam, 3, 1
duh samadakeyut, 3, 2
du da dadyut, 1, 5
du da atadaya, 1, 1
durakye (nom. du. fem.), 1, 3
du samuddhat, 3, 3, *duhiya*, 1, 4
duhite (loc.), 1, 5
duh drit, 1, 3
duham, 3, 3, (loc.) 3, 3
du, 1, 3, *duyah* (gen.), 1, 4
duvay, 3, 3
du ur, 1, 3
du padu, 2, 5, (acc.) 2, 4, (loc. plur.) 2, 1,
 (gen. plur.) § II, 1
du alalam, 2, 2
duha upadadhat, 2, 5 *duya isidhat* 1, 3
duradadhat, 2, 1, *durayadadhat* 1, 6, 2
 3, 4, *duhate* 1, 11 *duradhat* (loc. neut.), 3
 1, *duradadhat*, 2, 1, § 1, 6
duhya, 2, 2
duhyam (acc. in quot.), 1, 2 (abl.) 1, 3,
 (gen.) 1, 4, (acc. plur.) 2, 3
na (no verb), 1, 3, 3, 3, (with opt.) 1, 4, 5, 5,
 3, 27 (with fut. and its after *pat*) 3, 2, *chayut*
na frimol 2, 4 *na tui*, 3, 1, *na-came*,
 1, 3, 3 (ex. conj.)
natrinats (acc.), 1, 6
natu, 2, 3, 4
natk apinaha 3, 3
natipinilapim (instr.), 1, 4
natruca, 3, 3
natma, 3, 3, (acc.) 3, 3
natyut, 3, 2
natrinahya, 1, 6
natu takt, 1, 3
natudh, 1, 5 Cf. *Ind. Stud.*, XV III 96, n. 1
natulhanam, 3, 1, (abl.) 3, 2
natkavayaya, 1, 5
natarkyam (acc. masc.), 1, 3
natu prahayata, 1, 4, *natyut* (in quot.), 1, 2
natu, 3, 3
natuh, 2, 2, (acc.) 1, 2, (dat. du.) 1, 6
natupode, 1, 6
natutik, 2, 2
natca, 2, 2
natadida, 2, 2, 4
natadidastemah, 2, 2
natcovitkaya, 1, 5
natcovimkham, 1, 1
natcovayamiz (nom. du.), 1, 3
nataya, 1, 6
natyut, 1, 5
nat pratipadyate, 1, 5, *natkalya*, 1, 4,
natkhamam (neut.), 3, 1, *natkalya*, 1, 3
nat (acc.), 1, 6
natmalra, 1, 3
natman, 3, 3, § 1, 1
natkhamiyayut, 1, 5
natkal, 1, 2, (with gen.) 4
natkardhe, 1, 4
nat (acc.), 1, 4 *natkhat* (in quot.), 1, 1
natam (acc.), 1, 4, *nat*, 1, 6, 3, 1, *natkhat*,
 1, 6, 3, 1 *natkhat*, 1, 6
nat 1, 4
natkhat, 1, 3
natkam 1, 2, 2, 2, (gen.) 1, 1
natkapa, 1, 4
natkhat, 1, 2, 3, (with gen.) § II, 1
nat, 3, 3
nat khondu (acc.), 1, 6
natkhamadhat (acc. or perhaps nom. at part
 of quot.), 1, 1
natkam (acc. masc.), 1, 4, 3, 1, *natkamiz*
 (masc.), 3, 1, *natkam* 1, 2
natkam (adv.), 1, 1
natkham, 3, 3
natkhat 3, 1
natkam 2, 2, *natkam* 1, 2, 2
natkam 1, 6
natkam. natkam, 3, 2
natkham, 1, 5
natkam 3, 2
natkam, 1, 2

- carmakema*, 3, 3
carre, 3, 3, *carina* (acc.), 3, 1
carish, 2, 5
casuilaroti (acc.), 3, 2
casullarantaman'raunai, 3, 2
✓cah adhyūh, 3, 3, *✓cah*, § II, 3, *✓cahale*, 1, 4
ca, 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 1, 3, 3, -- *ca*, 1, 3, 1, 1
ca, 3, 3, *ca ca ca*, 1, 1, *ca ca*, 3, 1.
✓ca udvayati, 1, 3, *cauata*, 1, 3
canan (acc.), 1, 4
Caiahsajamam, 2, 4
canistoh, 3, 4
canavah, 2, 1.
✓cad cad, 3, 3
canhamah, 1, 3, *canhamam* (acc.), 2, 4
canvayah (abl.), 1, 1
canvayitahamarena, 3, 1
canvayaprabarti, 1, 1.
canam, 1, 4
canahah, 1, 3, (acc.) 2, 3, (loc.) 1, 3
✓can parvate (loc.), 1, 1.
✓can parvate (loc. masc.), *canvay*, 1, 1
can (acc.), 1, 4 (✓*can*).
can, 3, 2, *canahah*, 2, 3, better *can*
can, 3, 3
canahama (masc.), 3, 3
can cadetah, 3, 2, (gen.) 3, 2
✓canah vnyahyan, 1, 5
✓can parvate (in quot.), 1, 1, *can*
canvay, 1, 3, *canvay*, *canvay*, 3, 2
✓can *canvay*, 1, 6, 3, 3, *canvay*, 3, 3,
canvay, 3, 1
canvayam, 3, 2
canvayam, 1, 4
canvay, 1, 5
✓can *canvayam*, 3, 3
canvay, 1, 6
canvayah, 1, 5
canvay, 1, 4, *canvayah*, 1, 3
✓can *canvay*, 1, 1, 5
✓can *canvay*, 1, 1, 5
✓can *canvay*, 1, 1, 5
canvay, 2, 1, (acc.) 1, 2
canvay, 2, 3, 4, 3, 1, (acc.) 2, 2
✓can *canvay*, 1, 4
✓can *canvay*, 3, 2
canvay, 1, 6
canvay, 1, 1 (perhaps nom.), 2, 2, 4, 5, 3, 1, 2
ca, 1, 6
canvay, 3, 1
canvay, 2, 1
canvay (acc.), 1, 4
✓can *canvay*, 1, 6, 3, 1, § II, 4
canvay (acc.), 1, 2.
canvay, 3, 3
canvay, 3, 3
canvay, 1, 4
canvay, 1, 4
canvay, 2, 2
canvay, 2, 4
canvay (with dative, w. r. for *canvay*), 1, 6
canvay, 1, 3
canvay, 1, 6, 2, 1, *canvay*,
1, 6
canvay, 2, 5
canvay, 2, 1
canvay, 1, 5
canvay (nom. neut.), 2, 1, *canvay* (fem.), 2, 5,
canvay, 1, 3
canvay, 3, 1, § II, 18 (name of hymn)
canvay (acc. neut.), 1, 4, *canvay*, 1, 3
canvay (nom. cū), 1, 3
canvay (acc. masc.), 1, 4
canvay, 3, 3
canvay, 1, 5, 6
canvay, 1, 1
canvay (du.), 2, 3, 4, 5, *canvay*, 2, 1, *canvay*,
2, 2, 4
canvay, 2, 3, *canvay*, 1, 3
canvay, 1, 6, 2, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, (abl.)
1, 6
✓canvay *canvay*, 3, 2, cf. *canvay*, § II, 1.
✓canvay *canvay*, 1, 2, *canvay*, 1, 4, *canvay*,
§ I, 7
✓canvay *canvay*, 3, 3, *canvay*, 3, 3
✓canvay *canvay*, 1, 5, 1, 4, *canvay*, 1, 6,
2, 1, 3, 2, § I, 4
canvay, 1, 1
canvay, 1, 1, § II, 1, (acc. pl.) § II, 7
canvay, 2, 2, 3, 2
canvay, 1, 5
canvay, 3, 3
✓canvay *canvay*, 1, 1, 2, § I, 5, *canvay*,
3, 2, § II, 13, *canvay* (loc. masc.),
1, 4, *canvay* (loc. neut.), 1, 1, *canvay*, 1,

- 1, 2, 3 2, *śiśhale*, 3, 2, *śraśiśhāśhayaśi*,
 1, 4
śiśhane, 1, 6, 3, 1, 2, *śhkanamī* (acc), 1, 4,
śhkanāśhnam, 1, 4
śhūne, 1, 3, (acc. dū.) 1, 3
śhṛṣṭi *urāśhṛṣṭi*, 1, 4
śhayaṁ, 3, 3
śhṛṣṭa 1, 1
śhaya (neut.), 1, 4
śhāśhayaśharmam, 3, 3

śha śira śha, 1, 6, *aiśha śha*, 2, 4, *śhaṁ*, 3, 3,
śha śma, 3, 3

śham - āghnamti, 1, 5, *śhāśhayaṁ*, 3, 2
śham juhoti, 1, 1
śham aśhaya 1, 5
śhe śharāśi, 3, 2, *śharāśi*, 3, 3, 4, 5,
śharāśi, 1, 6, *śiśharāśi*, 1, 4, *śharāśh*, 3,
 2, *śhāśhayaśhāśh*, 1, 6, *śhāśhaya*, 1, 6, 2,
 3, 4, *śhāśhāśh*, 1, 6, *śhāśharāśh*, 1, 7,
śhāśhāśhaya, 1, 7
śha, 1, 1, 4, 3, 2
śhāśhāśhaya, 3, 3
śhāśhāśhaya (acc. v. 1. a), 1, 3
śhāśh, 1, 1
śhāśhāśh, 1, 4, (gen) 3, 3

INDEX VII

BEGINNINGS OF KHANDAS OF ĀRANYAKAS

Agam nara didhītibhīr aranyar ite annodya-
domah, I, 1, 2

aiha ākṣhīkāranyah, III, 2, 2. Ś VIII, 2

aiha kṣhīr āhur nirbhūjapradāh, III, 1, 5,
Ś VII, 11. Cf aihale nirbhūjapradāh, Ś
VII, 10, and aīha vni vnyam druma nirbhū
javadīrah, Ś VII, 12

aiha kṣhīr vnyam sarvanyam vica vpranistat, III,
1, 5

aiha nirbhūjapradāh, III, 1, 3 Cf Ś
VII, 10

aiha nishatya am, I, 1, 2

aiha śāṭhāyaya, III, 1, 2, Ś VII, 3

aiha iudādohah, I, 4, 1

aiha āsmā etat Arimādhīrah, III, 2, 6

aihalah saṁhīṭyaya vpranistat, III, 1, 1, Ś VII, 2

aihalo dāṣṭināh paktah, I, 4, 2

aihalo 'nyayakarah, III, 1, 4, Ś VII, 8

aihalo vīṭṭahāh kṣīṭṭah, II, 1, 2

arāṁimātra vjari bhūmeh, I, 2, 4

asat m me jarah, I, 2, 2.

dīmā vā idam, I, 4, 1.

a vā rathahā jātahāye, I, 2, 1, Ś I, 3

dṛṣṭ 3 uy vja ite, II, 1, 8

nīṭham nīṭham ite praj vadaute, II, 1, 2

apūṣṭe sloṭre trāṣṭham, V, 1, 2

aru Indragṇi, V, 3, 1.

asa vnam lakam adhy irat, II, 2, 1

asa u eta bhāṇāṭ-nyah, II, 2, 2

asa pantiṭa etat karma, II, 1, 1

asāṁlāṭ īrcāṁlāṭ, V, 2, 5

āḥ 'yam aṁtāṭ vnyam apūṣṭmāḥ, II, 6

guyatram praugam kuryad ity aīhā, I, 1, 3

guyatṛṣṭ trcāṁlāṭ, V, 2, 3

guyatram trcāṁlāṭi samasā, I, 4, 3

griva yasyalāṁ, V, 1, 1

catvarāḥ puruṣṭ ite Pūṣṭah, III, 2, 2,
(Pūṣṭ(y)ah) Ś VIII, 3

talraṭe bhah, II, 3, 8

tal Savatṛ vrmamāḥ I, 5, 3, Ś IX, 1, II 18

tal aīhāḥ kam pṛmāḥāya pṛhīḥāṭam, I,
2, 3

tal vī uḥ ksatayāṭnāḥ pṛatīṣṭ ite, I, 3, 2

tal ite pṛatīṣṭyāṭe I 3 3, 6

tal id asa bhūvāṁsu jyēṭhāṁ ite pṛatīṣṭyāṭe
etat tava, I, 3 4

tal id asa bhūvāṁsu jyēṭhāṁ ite pṛatīṣṭyāṭe
jāt vā, I, 3 7

tal id asa bhūvāṁsu jyēṭhāṁ tam m te kṛitṭi
V, 1, 6

tal vā idam bhṛatīṣṭhāṭram samjannam tal
jātāḥ II, 3, 7

tal vā idam bhṛatīṣṭhāṭram samjannam tal
hātāt, II 3 5

tal va idam bhṛatīṣṭhāṭram samjannam tūyṭ
yam, II, 2, 4

tal vā idam bhṛatīṣṭhāṭram samjannam tāya
vā elāya, II, 3 6

tam dca vṛṇayāṁlā, II, 2, 4

tam pṛapāḥbhīṭm pṛaṣṭ īyatṭ, II, 1, 4

tasya ja aṁtāṁam, II, 3, 2

tasya vāḥ tāntāḥ, II, 2, 6

tasya vāḥ vīṭṭam II, 2, 7

ta et dī-ṁlāṭ, II, 4, 2

tā māṭma vīṭṭāṭe pṛmāṭe vā māṭāḥ, I, 3 5

tā māṭma vīṭṭāṭe pṛmāṭe vā māṭāḥ, I, 3, 8

prapa prapavram, VII, 17.

prano locakramia, IX, 7

mano locakramia, IX, 6.

malan indra, II, 8

maia prapavram, VII, 15

pat ityoma soevudam, VIII, 6

pa ipta eham, II, 9

yo ha vai gyuttham ca, IX, 1

val prapavram, VII, 7

val prameha samahajate, VII, 14

val samahate, VII, 18

ton mama, XI, 2

vaci me 'gnih prajvalitah voh, XI, 5

vaci me 'gnih prajvalitah voh dravye, XI, 6

Vidvanto ha va, I, 6

kratam locakramia, IX, 5

sam val prameha, I, 8

sa trptah pranam tarjayati, X, 3

sa trptah cakur tarjayati, X, 4

sa trptah kratam tarjayati, X, 6

sa trptah tad etad, X, 8

sa trpto manas tarjayati, X, 5

sa trpto vatas tarjayati, X, 7

sa trpto vacam tarjayati, X, 9

sa yade pranam, VII, 9

sarvad voh dravate, VII, 12

sa ha val, VIII, 3

hastavarasam pratihati, XII

hastavata pratipadyate, II, 1

VIII. INDEX TO INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

(Only the more important points are here referred to. References to the Introduction are to pages, to the Notes to the *Āraṇyakas*.)

- Abuse, employment of, in ritual, V, 1, 5, n. 17.
 Āgamaśruti Śāstra, 28.
 Agastya, 17, 33.
 Aitareya *Āraṇyaka*, MSS of, 1-11, commentaries on, 11-15, divisions of, 14-26, the Mahāvratā in, 26-39, the Upanisads of, 26-51, style and grammar, 51-74; relation of I and V, I, 2, 3, n. 5, date of III, III, 1, 1, n. 2.
 Aitareya Brahmana, 16 sq., relation to Kauṣṭhika Brahmana, 30-33, style and grammar, 81, 66, 67.
 Ānandakṛishṇa, *śūtras* on Śaṅkara's *Advaita*, 11, 12, 13 sq., 12.
 Āpatamba, knows Vedānta (?), 26.
 Āraṇyaka, meaning of, 12, III, 2, 6, n. 11.
 Āśvalāyana, "author" of *Āraṇyaka* IV (?), 18, 19, Śrauta Sūtra quoted in *Āraṇyaka*, V, 3, 2, n. 14, relation to Śaṅkara, *ibid.*
 Atharvavirsa Upanisad, known to Gaṇṇa, 26.
 Ātman, doctrine of, 40 sq.
 Bṛhadraṣṭhina Upanisad, 38.
 Bṛhadraṇyaka Upanisad, relation to Aitareya *Āraṇyaka* II, III, 41, 44-46.
 Bṛhaddevata, comparison of grammar of, with Aitareya *Āraṇyaka*, 71.
 Buddhism, relation to Aitareya *Āraṇyaka* II, III, 47-49.
 Chāndogya Upanisad, relation to Aitareya *Āraṇyaka* II, III, 41, 44-46.
 Charots (*trankra*), I, 5, 3, n. 6.
 Deussen, discussion of theory of significance of Upanisads, 41 sq.
 Epic, date of, 50; I, 5, 2, n. 19.
 Fire, significance of use of, in ritual, V, 3, 1, n. 21.
 Fire altar, bird form of, 101 sq., V, 1, 2, notes 2 and 3.
 Gṛtama, knows Atharvavirsa Upanisad, 26.
 Gṛtamaṇṇa, 17, 26.
 Gopaths Brahmana, date of, 25, 26, cf. *I' O J*, XII, 191 sq.
 Grammar (including Accidence, Syntax, and Vocabulary).
 e ENGLISH INDEX.
 Cases, 38, 39, 68, 69, Accus. with \sqrt{man} alternating with nom., III, 1, 4, n. 3, with *bra* (two accus.), III, 1, 3, n. 6, *f A. O. S*, XI, VIII, 378 sq., 398 sq.; Instr. with *antar* + \sqrt{e} , V, 3, 3, n. 21, with causative of $\sqrt{śan}$, III, 2, 4, n. 16; Dat. with *ram*, V, 1, 6, n. 3; Gen. predicative, I, 2, 2, n. 8, 3, 4, n. 10, II, 1, 4, n. 7, V, 3, 3, n. 2, partitive, with possessive adj., I, 2, 3, n. 6, with verb (*yaj*), V, 3, 3, n. 3; absolutely, II, 3, 1, n. 6, defining, IV, 1, n. 3, V, 1, 6, n. 3, construction of whole and part, I, 1, 4, p. 5, nom., II, 3, 8, n. 11.

* What is given in the Introduction is not repeated in the Index.

- Compounds, adjectival* *Upan*
ava, I, 3, 3, n 4
- Concord*, attraction of predicate, V, 2, 1,
 n 14, plural for dual (?), I, 1, 2, n 7;
 V, 2, 2, n 12, superlative agrees with
 subject, I, 2, 4, n 6, mase after mase
 and neut, II, 1, 7, n 1, neut adj pred,
 III, 1, 2, n 4
- Miscellaneous lengthening of vowels*, II, 3, 8,
 n 9 V, 2, 2, n 12, imprecise, III, 1, 2, n 2
- Modi*, 61-63, Conditional, III, 1, 4,
 n 3, Imperative in *sat*, V, 1, 5, n 1,
 Optative of characteristic, II, 1, 2, n 3,
 III, 2, 3, n 3, indefinite, III, 2, 1, n 1,
 V, 3, 2, n 11 *J R A S*, 1909, p 151.
 Imperative, I, 5, 2, n 8
- Numerals*, use of acc for nom., II, 2, 4,
 3, 3, V, 1, 1, n 1.
- Particles*, 65, 66, use of *sa*, I, 1, 2, n 3,
 use of *no*, V, 3, 3, n 12, use of *cama*,
 III, 1, 3, n 6, use of *sat*, II, 1, 1,
 n 10, 5, n 5
- Prepositions* 59, *adhi* with acc, II, 3, 1,
 n 6, *adhi* with acc, I 4 2 n 7, *api*
 with acc, II, 2, 5, n 8, *abhi* with
 acc, V, 3, 2, n 6, *sutrena* with acc,
 V, 3, 1, n 6, *pura* with acc, I, 5, 1,
 n 13, *pakal* with gen, V, 1, 4, n 15
- Pronouns*, 58, *enam* III, 1 4, n 3
- Sandhi*, 55, irregular contraction of vowels,
 III 1, 3, n 2, 2 4 n 11, V, 3 2, n 9.
of am, V, 1, 6, n 4
- Tenses*, 59-62, Perfect and Imperfect, I,
 2, 1, n 6, cf *J R A S*, 1909, p 150,
 Perfect, original force of, II, 1, 8, n 8
- Verbal Nouns and Participles*, 63, 64,
 infin in *taḥ*, I, 1, 1, n 4, gerund and
 partic. with *an*, III, 1, 4, n 3, 2, 4,
 n 7, gerund (time of), I, 3, 1, n 1
- Poke*, use of middle as passive in perfect
 forms, III, 1, 1, n 3, in present and
 imperfect V, 2, 2, n 14; in participle,
 I, 2 2, n 5
- § SANSKRIT INDEX
- anantamam*, I, 2, 2, n 11
- atishā*, I, 2 2, n 11, I, 1, 6,
- atishā*, I, 1, 1, n 6
- anantamam*, I, 4, 1, n 11
- anya 'nyam*, III, 1, 6, n 7.
- abhiyuktas* (?), III, 1, 6, n 5
- aver eke*, II, 7, n 1.
- aiyā bhāṭayan*, III, 2, 3, n 4
- akṣar*, I, 2, 2, n 11
- akṣodake*, V, 3, 3, n 17
- akṣayant*, V, 3 3, n 22.
- antāḥ*, I, 4, 1, n 9
- nakṣ* (?), III, 2, 5
- mana*, V, 1, 4, n 11
- paran* II, 4, 3, n 2 Cf *Int Stud*,
 XVII, 190
- brahma*, III, 2, 3, 304, 367
- raṣṭantaro*, V, 1, 3, n 3
- ṣṭr*, 23
- zana*, V, 1, 4, n 3
- vydhis*, V, 2, 1, n 2
- saṃśaṣṭanā*, I, 4 7, n 10
- smu* (?) III, 1, 2, n 4
- Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brahmana* 46, V, 3, 2, n 3
- Āryāyana*, grammarian date of, 22, 24
- Katyāyana*, author of *Sarvanukraman*, 21, 24
- Kanvaka Brahmana*, relation to *Āitareya*
Brahmana, 31 33, 29
- Kanvaka Upaniṣad*, relation to *Āitareya Ām*
nyaka II, III, 4, n 2, 46
- Āśvamedha*, interest in philosophy, 50, III, 2 6,
 n 11, *J R A S*, 1908, pp 568 sq
- Magical rites*, I, 2, 3, n 1, V, 1, 5, notes 13, 14,
 15 and 17
- Mahadevika*, 12
- Mahāntareya*, 21, 39
- Mahāntareya Upaniṣad*, 29
- Mahāntareya*, 18, IV, n 1
- Mahāvata*, 26-39, see my *Saṃśaṣṭanā Ām*
nyaka, pp 73-85
- Mahāntareya Āitareya*, 16 17, I, 2, 1, n 4, II,
 3, 5, n 4, III, 2, 6, n 12.
- Mantra*, style of, I, 2, 5, n 7, V, 3 2, n 17
- Manuscript*, description of, 2-3, value of, 12.
- Maruṭvāṣṭa*, 28
- Metre*, II, 2, 8, n 1
- Kṛtadga*, 17.
- Na* *kaṣṭha* *kaṣṭha*, 28

OXFORD

PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

BY HORACE HART, M.A.

PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY